DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 100 TM 002 341

AUTHOR Warren, Jonathan R.; Roelfs, Pamela J.
TITLE Student Reactions to College: The Development of a Questionnaire through which Junior College Students Describe their College Experiences. Final Report.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, Calif.; Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, Calif.
REPORT NO PR-72-23; RDR-72-73-4
PUB DATE Oct 72
NOTE 101p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Data Collection; *Junior College Students; Post Secondary Education; *Questionnaires; Statistical Data; *Student College Relationship; Student Needs; *Student Reaction

ABSTRACT

The need for a new type of standardized procedure to learn what educational concerns junior college students have and how effectively they felt they're needs were being met led to the development of a questionnaire to meet the need. This report presents a description of the various phases through which the questionnaire was developed and made ready for publication. The 27 junior colleges who participated in the project are listed together with their characteristics. Students Reactions to College (Response Distributions for 27 Colleges), Spring 1971 are provided in relation to: Characteristics of Student Sample; Students' In-Class Activities; Students' Concerns about Their Overall College Programs and Their Plans for the Future; Students' Experiences in Studying for Courses; Students' Experiences with the College's Regulations and Administrative Procedures; Students' Living Conditions; Students' Interpersonal Experiences on Campus. The final questionnaire is provided. (For related document, see TM 002 342.) (DB)

ED 072100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REPORTS

RDR-72-73, NO. 3

PROJECT REPORT
PR-72-23 OCTOBER 1972

STUDENT REACTIONS TO COLLEGE

The Development of a Questionnaire Through Which Junior College Students Describe Their College Experiences

Jonathan R. Warren
and
Pamela J. Roelfs

TM 002 211
342 342

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

ED 072100

Student Reactions to College

The Development of a Questionnaire through which Junior College Students Describe their College Experiences

Final Report

Jonathan R. Warren
Pamela J. Roelfs

October 1972

The project reported herein was carried out with funds provided by the College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service.

Contents

I.	Origins of the Questionnaire	1
II.	Interviews	6
III.	Conferences	18
IV.	Early Drafts	21
V.	Format Trials	25
VI.	Trial Administrations	31
VII.	The Final Questionnaire	43
VIII.	Summary	51
	References	53

Appendices:

A. College Characteristics, Trial Administrations
B. Trial Administration Results
C. Final Questionnaire
D. Corresponding Items, Trial and Final Versions

Acknowledgements

A large number of people have been involved in the development of the questionnaire, Student Reactions to College, since it was first suggested by K. Patricia Cross. Junior college experts who served as consultants in the early stages of the project were Paul Becker, Ernest H. Berg, Charles C. Collins, Joseph W. Fordyce, Jerry H. Girdner, Ralph Hillsman, Jame Matson, Leland L. Medsker, Martin C. Olavarri, and Dale Tillery. Collins, Cross, Girdner, and Matson continued to participate throughout the questionnaire's three-year development on an advisory committee that included at various times, Lloyd Baysdorfer, Dorothy Knoell, Donald Peterson, William Preston and Gilberto Villarreal.

The interviews that established the basic content were organized and directed by Paul Christensen, Janet Ruyle, and Sam Toney of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Junius Davis of the Southeastern Office of Educational Testing Service, Barton Herrscher and John Roueche, then of the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Donald E. Hood of the Southwestern Office of Educational Testing Service, Richard Ray of the Learning Institute of North Carolina, Richard Rooney of the College Entrance Examination Board, and Stuart Huff, Coordinator of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program at the University of North Carolina. Some of the same people plus John Vaccaro and Claire Fitzpatrick, of the Midwestern Office of the College Entrance Examination Board, gave valuable help in setting up the trial administrations. Ralph Hillsman, of the City College of San Francisco, and Jerry Girdner, of the West Valley Joint Community College District, arranged for trials of an early form of the Questionnaire at their colleges.

Students who were sensitive, critical, and constructive in a careful and detailed review of the content and wording of the items were Jorge Chacon, Sandy Chamberlain, Beverly Conwright, Robin E. Cox, Janna Falk, Herbert Gunther, Renato Larin, Jean Lawson, Dauphne Mitchell, Pat Morel, Rhodessa Robertson, Luz Robles, Joe Salinaro, Ruth Singleton, Sandy Swanson, and Michael Wong.

Within ETS Alice Irby, Richard Levine, and Winton Manning were particularly helpful in reviewing early forms of the questionnaire and giving general guidance to the project. Eldon Park was continually supportive. Nancy Beck, John Bianchini, Richard Peterson, George Schlekat, Elizabeth Stewart, George Temp, and Edward Tibby all from time to time gave advice and suggestions that were sometimes followed. Richard Minard and Martin Goldman supervised the data processing, and Inge Chwang designed the layout of the trial version of the questionnaire.

Pat Cross, besides being responsible for getting the whole thing started, gave invaluable advice and guidance throughout the prolonged period of development. Moreen Kinney has probably typed as many words for this project as for any other she's worked on. She also very capably organized and typed every item of every version of the questionnaire, from the first to the last.

The College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service together generously accepted the entire financial burden of the project.

I. Origins of the Questionnaire

A few years ago Patricia Cross completed a "descriptive survey of the junior college student population" (Cross, 1968) that indicated several important gaps in understanding about junior college students as a population differing in many ways from college students generally. "While we have some information about students' reactions to their junior college experiences, almost all of it is from students who later transferred to four-year colleges. We really do not know how vocationally oriented students feel about their junior college experiences, nor do we know much about the satisfactions and dissatisfactions of those who drop out. We know almost nothing about those students with obviously unrealistic aspirations (Cross, 1968, p. 50)."

These observations of a number of informational gaps led Cross to suggest a need for a new kind of standardized procedure that would help junior college administrators and faculty members learn what educational concerns junior college students had and how effectively they saw their needs being met. The College Entrance Examination Board followed her suggestion with funds for an interview survey of junior college students, faculty members, and administrators to verify the need she perceived and to gather information on the form and content of a questionnaire that would help meet that need.

Interviews conducted early in 1969 at 18 geographically scattered junior colleges generally confirmed the desirability of some form of questionnaire to gather information systematically about junior college students' perceptions of their college experiences. With joint support from the College Board and Educational Testing Service, a questionnaire was developed, criticized, modified, tried out, revised, tried again, revised again, and made ready for publication. This report is a description of that process.

Specifications for development of the questionnaire

In Cross's original proposal for the development of a junior college questionnaire, several specifications were established that guided the questionnaire's development. In spite of some modifications, they were followed fairly closely throughout the project.

1. The primary purpose of the questionnaire was to serve as a vehicle through which students could provide administrators and faculty with information to be used in planning and revising educational programs and services. Emphasis was to be on areas of student concern about which the college could do something. The information provided was to indicate actions that could be taken by the college. Research purposes were to be secondary.

2. The questionnaire was to provide information about the collective views of groups of students. Responses of individual students would be used only to arrive at those collective views and would probably not be useful indicators of individual student attitudes.

3. The questionnaire results were to be understandable to junior college staff members and students without the need for interpretation by a researcher or methodologist. The items were to be specific enough that possible corrective actions for undesirable situations would be apparent, yet general enough to be more than trivial. For example, an item like "my instructors are doing a good job" would be too general to be useful. "My math instructor doesn't correct our weekly quizzes" is probably too specific to

be part of a broadly used questionnaire of limited length. But "my instructors are available outside class at times convenient to me" carries general information that may be important and about which action can be taken if a large proportion of students say it is false.

4. Simplicity and directness were to be major goals, both in the content and wording of the items and in the nature of the information provided in the results. The users should neither be swamped with data nor provided only with general summaries from which few specific conclusions could be reached. Items should be worded to deal directly with issues of concern rather than to approach them through subtle allusions.

5. Each item should be capable of standing alone, providing useful information independently of other items, and the usefulness of the information should be obvious to the students. Asking students to respond to questionnaires having little obvious relevance to their education or to their college is increasingly difficult to defend.

6. The respondents were to be students who had had a minimum of about one term's experience at the college. While the views of new students, prospective students, faculty members, administrators, alumni, employers, and others concerned with junior colleges all are important for some purposes, they were not to be the concern of the present questionnaire. The content and wording of the items were therefore to be appropriate to experienced junior college students.

7. Flexibility should be provided in the uses to which the results could be put. Opportunities should be provided for individual colleges to add items written locally to reflect concerns of particular interest. Provisions should also be made for grouping students in ways of interest at each particular college. Grouping according to distance of the college from the students' homes, for example, may be important at one college but not another, while grouping according to age may be important at the second college but not the first.

These considerations helped in the resolution of a number of issues in the development of the questionnaire, some relatively minor and others more important. One such issue was the determination to consider experienced students as the respondents. This permits the items to deal retrospectively with recent past experiences, but it also prevents the questionnaire from being used effectively with entering students. Another issue revolved around the instrument's purpose as an indicator of collective student views. With this purpose, identification of individual students is unnecessary and student anonymity could be built into the procedures for administering the questionnaire. While student anonymity is considered important, some relaxation of this point has been made in providing for a local option that would permit identification of individual students.

Anticipated content

Cross's (1968) review of junior college student characteristics had suggested a number of areas about which students could provide useful information. Among them were the following:

- Self concepts--perceived strengths to build upon, weaknesses to be remedied.
- Interests, preferred activities, personality orientations, styles of living.
- Goals, aspirations, reasons for attending college.
- Experiences in college--with classes, other students outside class, programs, and services.
- Home environment--conflicts, sources of encouragement, problems of housing, transportation, etc.
- Financial needs.
- Problems of educational and vocational planning.

All these areas have not been equally represented in the final questionnaire. Self concepts and interests, for example, gradually lost ground as the questionnaire was developed. The students' reactions to the college as an external, environmental influence on student experiences took precedence over student attitudes about themselves and other person-focused views. An exception was in the area of student plans, which remained in the questionnaire. This shift in emphasis resulted from the expressions of concern voiced in the interviews and from student reactions to the early trial items. The final version therefore evolved through several stages from a version in which the areas above were more equally represented to one that more accurately reflected the concerns students said should be expressed.

II. Interviews

Interviews to identify concerns of students, faculty members, and administrators were conducted early in 1969 with 162 students, 60 faculty members, and 45 administrators in 18 junior colleges in five states from coast to coast. The interviewers were staff members or graduate students associated with the College Entrance Examination Board, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, the Master of Arts in Teaching program at the University of North Carolina, the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, the Learning Institute of North Carolina, and several offices of ETS. The interviews were loosely structured around 20 general, open-ended questions that the interviewers elaborated on at their discretion. The persons interviewed were asked, in effect, to describe issues they considered important in each of the areas represented by the 20 broad questions.

In each college, interviews were conducted with 2 to 4 persons from among the president, the dean of instruction, the dean of student personnel, the director of counseling, or comparable administrators; with 2 to 4 faculty members, including vocational or technical teaching staff as well as transfer program staff; and with 6 to 10 students. Many kinds of students were included--adults and part-time students as well as full-time students fresh from high school; minority group students; the academically talented as well as the academically undistinguished; those active in student organizations and those not; satisfied, uncritical students as well as contentious, vocal, critical students.

Because of the exploratory nature of the interviews, the questions were intended to be no more than indicators of broad areas within which the persons interviewed could describe their own observations and experiences as members of

a junior college community. For this reason interviewers were encouraged to give the junior college person enough freedom to say what seemed important to him instead of mechanically and superficially running through the questions. They were to depart substantially from the interview guide if a new direction to the questioning seemed likely to be productive. The interview structure was intended to be open enough to let issues important to the person interviewed emerge without prompting. The guide was to be used simply as a source of questions to restart the process when the information flow slowed and as a check on general topics that were to be covered. An interview required approximately one hour for staff members and an hour-and-a-half for students.

Records of the interviews consisted of brief notes rather than verbatim transcripts. Interviewers wrote on a separate sheet in longhand, keying responses to the corresponding questions in the guide. When they had modified the questions in the guide, or asked different questions, they recorded the new or changed question in their interview notes. The recording procedure thus preserved the ideas expressed by the students and staff, while key phrases were recorded verbatim and enclosed in quotation marks.

Interviews were conducted individually, but also in groups of two or three persons. The group interviews were often particularly productive as points got corroborated or as a comment by one person triggered an amplifying or contrasting remark by another person. The persons interviewed had been informed of the reasons for the interviews several days in advance, and so had had time to reflect on the issues of concern to them rather than having to respond only with their initial thoughts.

Content of the interviews

Four major kinds of comments emerged in the interviews. The concerns most often expressed by the interviewed students dealt with (1) instructional problems, such as the ineffectiveness of remedial courses, or lack of faculty interest in students and (2) administrative problems, such as difficulty in scheduling desired courses. But these often were tied to (3) student goals and expectations, as when course requirements seemed inappropriate to the student's goals, or (4) living arrangements, as when the desired classes couldn't be scheduled because of constraints imposed by commuting or a job.

Instructional experiences include out-of-class studying, college facilities, and staff-student relations as well as classroom experiences. Administrative requirements include such things as course prerequisites, patterns of courses required for graduation (e.g., "breadth" requirements), and administrative regulations (e.g., a course cannot be dropped after the fifth week of the semester). Living arrangements include housing, transportation, financial matters, and social and extracurricular life. Student goals and expectations were inferred directly from comments indicating what the students would like and indirectly from the kinds of problems they said they were facing or staff members thought students might be facing.

The volume of student comments in each of the four general areas, and the number of issues raised in each, suggested that the instrument be designed with instructional issues given the major emphasis, administrative requirements secondary emphasis, and goals and living arrangements some representation.

Faculty and administrator views could be organized in the same four broad areas as the student views, but their emphases differed from those of the students. Staff members stressed a desire to know what the students wanted from college, their goals and expectations. This view seemed to reflect a genuine and pervasive concern on the part of the staff members to provide educational experiences the students would want and value. But it also implied an attitude that if the staff members could only be told what the students wanted in terms of moderately long-range goals, the staff could then, as professional educators, organize programs that would bring students to those goals.

The student concerns were more immediate. Students wanted to tell the staff about the good and bad aspects of college as they appeared in the students' daily encounters with the college. The process of their education was their primary concern; the outcome or product was important but secondary. Staff members, in contrast, were more interested in hearing about the students' desired outcomes than about the daily processes of education.

This is an over-simplified statement of staff and student differences in viewpoint. Some staff members did express more interest in immediate student concerns than in their long-range goals. Nevertheless, the general picture of staff members being primarily interested in knowing the students' educational objectives, while students wanted to deal with more immediate problems, is reasonably accurate. And the two views, in spite of their different emphases, can be accommodated in a single set of items.

Detailed observations from the interviews, organized into the four areas just described, are presented below. These observations and others like them were the primary source of item content for the questionnaire.

Interview Results

Instructional Experiences

A system is needed for students to evaluate the quality of instruction. Some students criticize individual teachers; others criticize teaching methods.

Faculty members also criticize the teaching as unimaginative and irrelevant, suggesting that teaching techniques other than lectures be tried.

Students express their view of faculty indifference in such statements as, "They don't teach, they test." They feel they are left on their own to get whatever they can from the book. They also complain that the coursework is "busywork," not challenging, only time-consuming. Some students say their instructors "go over and over the material until everybody gets it."

On the other hand, many students feel the faculty is overloaded with classes and too many extraneous duties. Students get discouraged over the inability to see faculty. Faculty salaries and working conditions are often considered inadequate.

Low morale is indicated by students who say, "It's like a high school," and faculty members who say, "It needs more of an academic environment."

"The faculty expect too much" is countered by the equally often stated view that "the faculty expect too little."

Both faculty and students feel a need for younger teachers and teachers with a background in college teaching rather than in high school teaching. Administrators do not necessarily agree with this. Teachers from high school backgrounds tend to treat the older adolescents as high school students. Veterans are especially resentful.

Remedial courses evoke ambivalent reactions from students. Administrators generally feel that they are doing a good job in their tracking and tutorial programs and in their efforts for academically deficient students. Students do recognize their academic deficiencies. They appreciate the opportunity offered in remedial courses to improve their basic capabilities, but they don't like the stigma associated with such courses. They also resent having to take them without academic credit and are not impressed with the "help" provided by many of the courses.

Faculty members are concerned about the selection and placement of students in remedial programs, occupational programs, or any set of courses for which students are expected to have certain qualifications, or to lack certain qualifications.

Instructors would like tests that place students appropriately with respect to sequences of remedial English or mathematics courses. In many of the occupational programs a test of mechanical information is considered desirable.

According to students, selection or placement procedures that seem reasonable to college staff often add to their confusion, uncertainty, and discouragement. Such procedures sometimes limit the options open to many students and impede their progress through the institution.

Many students have trouble with the institutional structure, administrative or instructional, but feel they are not able to complain about their difficulties effectively. They say better channels are needed for expression of student grievances and more decision-making power should be given to student representatives and to the student body as a whole.

Faculty members and administrators tend to say that students participate freely in college affairs. Students say that may be true, but that the participation is ineffectual.

Most administrators and faculty feel it is difficult to determine how much students are participating in the existing opportunities for student involvement in governance, or how they feel about their role.

Students voice a strong desire for feedback on studies of student characteristics and opinion. Some are suspicious of the motives of the researchers, the sponsoring agencies, and those who have access to the information.

Communication is not as open and effective as faculty members and administrators think. Administrators think they are reasonably close to the students; the students don't. In some cases students don't even know who the administrators are. Exceptions are those students active in student affairs.

Faculty in general feel that administrators are too far removed from the students. Even so, administrators say they feel closer to students than they do to the faculty.

Teacher-to-teacher communication is very poor, and if it does exist, it is primarily within departments.

Faculty often show a reluctance to change, i.e., a desire to preserve the status quo.

Communication is often poor between instructors and counselors, and conflicting perceptions exist as to the college's function and the instructors' and counselors' roles.

The faculty feel they are not involved in decision making. Faculty and counselors are critical of administrators because they feel administrators are not aware of their problems, and when they are they are slow to move.

On the other hand, administrators express difficulty in working with faculty senates and in finding faculty who are willing to understand and become involved with students.

Although communication seems better between faculty and students than between administrators and students, areas of tension or mistrust exist between students and faculty. At many colleges, informal contact between students and faculty is rare.

The punitive effect of grades and the instructors' power to penalize students inhibit student-faculty communication. (A grading system of Pass or No Credit is suggested as one way to remove the punitive element from grades.) So does the tendency for some faculty members to treat junior college students simply as older high school students. The segregation of rest rooms and eating areas into faculty and student facilities is also a source of student resentment.

Interestingly, faculty members seem more concerned than students about faculty-student communication.

Students are critical of the library and suggest it be expanded.

All groups note the lack of quiet places for study on campus. Students say the library is not a good place to study, but most feel that they cannot study well at home either. Faculty members believe the home environment is not conducive to study.

The book store should be more responsive to student needs and should be more efficient.

Suggested additions to facilities are laboratories, shops, an auditorium, a gymnasium, and more faculty office space.

Administrative Requirements

Registration procedures and other administrative irritants are widely criticized and at times provoke more than irritation. Some students see much of the administrative routine to which they are subjected as hidden tuition in the sense that their time is imposed on simply for the convenience of the administrative staff.

A number of comments dealt with the problems students face in working their way through the organizational structure of the institution or with the constraints imposed on students by organizational patterns, for example in fulfilling program requirements.

Registration procedures need to be improved. According to students, achieving a desirable program of classes is difficult primarily because of time conflicts or an insufficient number of sections. Required courses are especially hard to get. Classes fill so quickly at registration that students often are forced to fill out their programs with a hodge-podge of courses at the last minute.

Students want organized orientation sessions prior to registration.

Some students feel that the teacher/student ratio is too rigid. If a teacher is particularly good, the size of his classes should not be arbitrarily limited.

Other problems with organizational structure have to do with transferring course credits to four-year institutions, to parallel institutions, from other institutions into the junior college, and across programs within a single college. Students express uncertainty and concern over all these procedural questions.

Disagreement is found with respect to rules. Students, more than faculty, criticize college rules for a variety of reasons. Many feel the rules are too lenient and permissive and advocate establishing new rules, such as dress codes, and stricter enforcement of existing rules, such as class attendance requirements. These students tend to feel that other students goof off, need regulations, and have no regard for school grounds or property.

Other students feel the rules for student conduct are too much like high school rules. To them, there are a lot of "picky" rules, so many, in fact, that few or none of them are really enforced. They advocate abolition of dress codes and "cut" systems. These students feel that the faculty and administration do not treat students as adults.

Admission requirements for particular classes are an important issue with both faculty and students. Some say the requirements are too strict; others say they're too loose.

At several colleges, presidents talked about their open door policy, but the students felt is existed only in principle, not in practice. Students and faculty together complain of the consequences of open admission, especially the presence in college of the unmotivated, academically marginal students, who are seen to interfere with faculty members trying to teach and with more capable students trying to learn.

Students feel that grades are necessary, but there should be a "no report" grade in general education subjects and more use of the pass-no credit system.

Attrition is an issue administrators report. Where faculty members are strongly concerned with the success on the job of graduates of their programs, an unnecessarily high dropout rate may be induced, sometimes leaving as few as 25 percent of a program's entering students completing the program. Other reasons, of course, can also lead to high attrition with a program, and high attrition isn't always considered undesirable.

Wide disagreement exists, among students and among faculty, on the desirability of flexible or rigid curricula and of broad or narrow academic requirements. Some favor required, "well-rounded" programs for all students. Others, especially vocational students and faculty, think students have too many required courses outside their major field while supporting a highly structured program within a field. Still others think students should have wide latitude in their choices of all courses.

Some colleges have as their main function preparation for transfer to a four-year college. Others are almost entirely job-oriented, with little concern for transfer to senior institutions. Still others concentrate on educational remediation in preparation for the other two preparatory programs. Wherever there is an unbalanced emphasis on certain programs, some students are unhappy.

Students at colleges stressing transfer programs and who plan to get jobs feel their courses should have greater vocational relevance with respect to breadth, variety, and content. Students at job-oriented colleges but who want further education after junior college say their courses don't adequately prepare them for transfer to four-year colleges.

Ways of evaluating institutional effectiveness are needed, including gathering information on graduates.

Student Goals and Expectations

Students generally say they are personally getting what they want out of the college and doing what they want to do. However, a large number of students are uncertain about where they want to go and whether what they are doing is getting them there. They want help with self-direction, establishment of purposes, learning about available goals, and making decisions.

Many students don't think they have enough information to make decisions about courses or programs or jobs or what they might be using their college experience for. This makes many of them willing to follow instructions or standard programs if they think the faculty and administrators know what they are doing.

The faculty, on their side, often see one of their major functions to be giving direction, telling students what they should do, what courses to take, what occupations to prepare for, how to proceed through college to reach the highest educational level the student's aptitude will permit.

An impression produced by these comments and others is that students are often unsure of themselves and whether what they are doing is really productive. They want information from the faculty that will let them evaluate their current activities and directions so they can resolve their uncertainty.

What students would prefer, though, is not being directed by faculty or administrators, but being given enough information about possible options for them to decide their own directions. They are mildly resentful of the fact that neither the programs nor personnel of the college give them the information they need. They either don't consider or don't accept the view that the information they want may not exist and if it does the faculty may not have it to give them.

Students want to know, for example, whether they can be a nurse even if they can't handle chemistry or whether they have enough artistic ability to be an architect. When faculty members and counselors can't give them answers, the students are often left with a feeling of having been let down.

In spite of their uncertainties, students, especially the younger ones, find it difficult to admit that they need help. Counselors verify this in admitting that they are not overworked.

Students at a college fortuitously, because of location or some other relatively extraneous reason, often seem to be directed into a particular vocational (or transfer) program on the basis of availability of programs, or availability of openings in a program. For the large number of students who are uncertain about their goals, the initial direction of their program thus seems to be determined largely by happenstance. And, when these students have not yet developed a large measure of independence or when they attend an institution concentrating too much on one type of program, they sometimes find it difficult to change directions after getting started in college.

Differences in prestige or status among programs seem to influence students' decisions about their majors. All segments of the college feel uncertain what role the college staff plays, purposefully or inadvertently, in influencing those decisions.

Faculty, administrators, and students all express a desire for better counseling services. Students say they want a counseling service that can reduce their uncertainties. Their criticisms of the counseling services, which are frequent, center around the counselors' inability to give them adequate information -- about job possibilities, job requirements, transferability of course credits, course prerequisites at four-year institutions, and other "facts" with which to direct their activities.

Students often say they don't know to whom to go for certain kinds of help.

Administrators and faculty members give the complementary picture of the desired counseling service. They want better tests so they will be able to classify students better and direct them with more assurance through the various paths to jobs of further education. Both groups indicate that people in advisory capacities should be better prepared and that better communication is needed between the faculty and counselors.

On their side, counselors say they have little power and prestige; therefore, they can do very little to help the student.

The diversity of the student body is recognized as a problem. Most people agree that all students are not served equally well, and the various colleges seem to have their own strengths and weaknesses in this respect.

Two student groups -- older students and students whose academic skills are deficient -- have reasons for being in college that differ in a variety of ways from those of other students. Students in either of these groups often differ from other students in their immediate objectives, in the specificity of their goals, in their readiness to defer decisions while exploring various alternatives, in the kinds of programs they find suitable, and in other ways that go beyond simple differences in curricular preferences.

One common weakness, recognized by students and faculty alike, is a failure to accommodate adequately the older students who return to school after being away from it for several years. These students often feel out of place. While conscientious, their study patterns may not be efficient. Student activities are geared toward young, single adults, with the older students seldom participating in out-of-class college activities.

How to serve the variety of students enrolled seems to be a major problem. Many faculty members like the diversity in intellectuality of the students and find it a challenge to their teaching skills. All groups feel better accommodation is needed of the range of student abilities and educational goals.

Students and faculty as well as administrators are concerned about the local community's support with respect to part-time employment, housing, job placement of graduates, and assistance in training vocational students. Some faculty members think local industry should be responsible for helping with vocational programs that provide them with trained personnel. All agree that community support is important, and that where it is lacking, junior college can be a frustrating experience for students and faculty.

Some junior colleges, or some departments within a junior college, or some instructors within a department pride themselves on the accuracy with which they respond to occupational requirements within the surrounding community. Commendable as this is, it represents an educational orientation too narrow for many students who want to explore a variety of educational and occupational options.

Living Arrangements

Students repeatedly mention time as a major problem. Even the full-time, unmarried students juggle on-campus and off-campus activities, and travel between the two, to make the most of time that is broken up into a jumble of odd-sized pieces. The married, employed students have even more difficulty.

Although this is a problem not peculiar to junior colleges or to students, some attention needs to be given to class scheduling, administrative routine, transportation facilities, study facilities, food services, baby-sitting services, and other problems of simple existence and allocation of time.

More financial aid is needed.

Employment services should be better, both for part-time jobs while in college and for job placement after leaving college.

A number of students express concern about the job opportunities available for graduates with an AA degree who don't transfer but haven't taken an occupational program.

Extracurricular activities are often nonexistent. More social events and nonacademic campus programs are needed.

Agreement is widespread that physical facilities need improvement. All segments of the college feel there are insufficient funds to provide enough facilities--classrooms, student meeting places, etc. On most campuses there are inadequate facilities for parking, lounging, eating, studying, and recreation.

Students are aware of these inadequacies and their ill effects on the college. For example, the sterile buildings a college may occupy can dampen any spirit of consideration and warmth among a college community.

Many of the colleges have only minimal food services.

Help is needed with housing and transportation. Expanded parking facilities are wanted.

Students feel that the lack of a daily student newspaper contributes to the general lack of communication.

III. Conferences

The subjective analysis of reports of interviews structured as loosely as those conducted with the junior college students and staff has at least two deficiencies. First, no protection exists against the coloring of the results to reflect the biases of the person carrying out the analysis, whether done consciously or not. Second, a person who has had detailed interviews with a number of students and staff members can be expected to have formed valid and useful impressions of the college and its several constituencies as a collective result of the interviews, impressions that may not be apparent in any single interview report.

To remedy both these deficiencies, at least to some extent, two one-day conferences were held with the interviewers and other junior college personnel involved in the project. The conferences, one on the east coast and one on the west coast, were intended to clarify the information provided in the interview reports, establish some hierarchy of importance in the information to be gathered by the prospective questionnaire, and discuss its form and potential uses. As a result of the conferences several decisions further defining the nature of the questionnaire, with respect to both content and form, were possible. Matters relating to content have been incorporated in the detailed list presented in the previous section of issues discussed in the interviews. Issues regarding form are presented below.

1. The questionnaire was to be directed to experienced students rather than entering freshmen, since its purpose was to provide college personnel with information about student reactions to college--problems encountered and critical observations about the college's programs and procedures.

Faculty members, alumni, and potential employers, as well as entering students and high school seniors, were rejected as potential respondents. Even though these groups could provide useful information about a college's programs, all of them could not reasonably be accommodated with a single instrument. The most important source of information was considered to be current, experienced students.

2. The questionnaire had been planned from the first to provide institutional information rather than information about individual students. This view was strongly supported at the conferences. Reasonably general agreement seemed to be reached that student names should not be required and that individual students should not be identified on the answer sheets. In fact, many felt that student names should not even be optional, that no space should be provided in which names could be put. Other instruments, or special procedures in the use of the present questionnaire, such as precoding questionnaires administered to those kinds of students of particular interest, would be necessary for some purposes otherwise served through the identification of individual respondents. This seemed a reasonable price to pay for student trust.

3. The instrument was to be designed primarily as a device to help students convey to faculty and administration their views on how the college's programs and procedures might be improved. This purpose--giving students a vehicle for expressing their views--differs in a subtle but important way from the purpose initially contemplated--providing administrators with useful information. The constituency to be served by the questionnaire was primarily students and secondarily staff members. Services to these two constituencies should not be incompatible, which accounts for the subtlety of the distinction, but the

emphasis was to be clearly on the students. The need for an instrument directed explicitly to this revised purpose had been pointed out in a Report to the President by 22 congressmen who visited a number of colleges in 1969, talking informally with students. "On campus after campus we found widespread criticism from students who feel unable to communicate with administrators and faculty. They believe that no channel is open to them to make their views known (Congressional Record, 1969)."

That administrators and faculty should find the instrument valuable was of course important, but its value to them was considered largely dependent on the students' accepting the instrument as one directed to their own interests. The interviews and the conference participants' experiences indicated that many students resent being asked to spend time filling out questionnaires to serve some arcane purpose of an administrator. Students find little credibility in administrators' assertions that they need information from students in order to serve them more effectively. The instrument, therefore, was to serve the students directly by helping them communicate their ideas on what they consider important. An incidental consequence of this shift in orientation was that students, or a student representative, were to be sent reports of results directly, or at the minimum, procedures were to be established for students to have access to the results. Most of the conference participants felt that the instrument should also be available to student groups for administration and that students should be involved in the planning when the institution initiates its use.

In summary, the questionnaire should be completed anonymously by experienced junior college students to indicate their concerns and suggestions for improving their college experiences. The primary purpose should be to act as a channel for the communication of student views to the faculty and administration.

IV. Early Drafts

The first attempt at a questionnaire that would serve the intended purposes and deal with the content brought out in the interviews turned out to be more complex than seemed desirable. A short first section consisted of about 30 items on student goals or reasons for attending college to which students were to respond twice--once indicating the importance of each goal to them and once indicating how satisfied they were with their progress toward those goals.

The second section, which was to constitute the major part of the questionnaire, would consist of about 500 items organized into a three-level hierarchy. From six to eight moderately specific items were to be offered in each of the following areas of concern:

1. Teaching and instruction
2. College requirements--administrative and curricular
3. Student rules and regulations
4. Courses and scheduling--the mechanics of enrolling in and attending classes
5. Time and studying
6. Activities outside class
7. Living arrangements and transportation
8. Student plans and expectations

One item in the first area, for example, was "The instructors grade fairly." Students were to respond to that item on a five-point scale from "always false" to "always true", as illustrated in Figure 1. Depending on that response, the students then were given from four to six items through which they were to indicate the reasons for saying a statement was true or false. This kind of

3. The instructors grade fairly.

Always false	Usually false	Sometimes true, sometimes false	Usually true	Always true
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

I

Because (check one or more):

( )a. Grades are used as punishment if the instructor thinks you should do better.

( )b. They grade according to how much you agree with their point of view.

( )c. They allow personal feelings toward students to influence grades.

( )d. They set impossible standards; hardly anyone gets an A.

( )e. Their exams don't test how much you know.

II

Because (check one or more):

( )a. They allow for differences of opinion.

( )b. Standards of performance are reasonable.

( )c. They use a variety of measures to determine a grade.

( )d. The exams are realistic.

( )e. They let students know what is expected of them.

Figure 1. Illustrative item

elaboration is also illustrated in Figure 1 for the item on the fairness of instructors' grades. The content of the basic statements and of the reasons for their being true or false were culled from the interviews. Instructions to the students were to check the elaborative comments only in that column that was pertinent unless their response was "Sometimes true, sometimes false."

Six items in each of eight areas, with ten elaborative statements for each item would make a total of 48 basic items and 480 elaborative items. No student, however, would be expected to respond to all the items. First, the instructions to the students asked them to skip any items dealing with areas they considered relatively unimportant. Second, only about half of the elaborative items would be checked. Most students, then, would be expected to respond to something on the order of 150 items in total. Having chosen those 150 items from among more than 500 on the basis of their importance to him, the student would have provided far more useful information than he would if the questionnaire were limited to about 150 items, with the student asked to respond to all of them.

Review of the above prototype questionnaire by a number of people within ETS led to some reduction and simplification. The small first section consisting of items on student goals was abandoned, and its content was incorporated into the remainder of the questionnaire. Rather than being stated explicitly, goals were to be inferred from the student's responses to items about his specific concerns, such as, "I'm not learning much that will be useful in a job." The basic items were reduced from 48 to 30, each with about ten elaborative items giving reasons for the student's response to the basic item.

Further review within ETS led to the conclusion that the dual form of items described above was still too complex to be feasible. A third draft questionnaire was then developed that retained the content of the 300 items of the

second version but presented it in a simpler format. The 30 issues represented by the basic items of the second draft were retained, and each issue was made the basis for ten specific items. In the third draft, however, each item was to be responded to independently of any other instead of in the two-stage process of the first draft. The ten items representing each issue were made up of three different kinds of items, but the ability of each item to stand alone, without reference to any other item, seemed to simplify the response process.

In every group of ten items, three referred to specific events during the preceding two weeks (e.g., talked to an instructor about a grade). Four items referred to general impressions about the college (e.g., working for grades often keeps me from learning as much as I might). The final three items in each group of ten were statements to which the student would respond by indicating whether or not he would like to find that kind of experience in college (e.g., grades based more on day-to-day work than a few big exams or papers).

This third draft of the questionnaire, requiring a less complex task of the respondents than either of the first two drafts while retaining the content developed from the interviews, went through three more preparatory processes before being given a major trial with a large number of students. Two small-scale pilot trials, each at a single junior college, were conducted to determine what response format to adopt. Finally, a group of 16 students from 6 junior colleges spent two days reviewing the questionnaire in detail, item by item, suggesting changes in wording and occasionally in content to make the items sound natural and realistic to junior college students.

V. Format Trials

Two decisions about the format of the questionnaire were examined with two small pilot administrations in October, 1970. One was to test the feasibility of giving students a large number of items with instructions to skip those they consider unimportant. The other was to determine the effects of different numbers of response categories.

Option to skip items

The purpose of the questionnaire is to indicate common student perceptions of the college and of the students' experiences in the college. If students are encouraged to skip items they consider unimportant, the time to complete the questionnaire can be spent on important issues rather than being partially dissipated on items that are unimportant to some groups of students or in certain situations. A larger total number of items and broader content could be offered, and more useful information might be gathered. On the other hand, whether any real saving in time could be achieved, and whether the decisions to skip items would be based on item importance or on extraneous considerations, such as the number of words in the item and the time it would take to read it, were not known. Further, the possibility seemed worth testing that item interrelationships, and therefore item meanings, when all the items were important to the student would be different than when some were important and some unimportant.

To examine the effects of the option to skip items, a heterogeneous group of 558 students at West Valley College in Campbell, California, was split approximately into thirds. One group completed the entire questionnaire, skipping items considered unimportant. The other two groups completed random halves of the questionnaire without the option to skip items. The questionnaire was

administered in classes, with the three forms distributed randomly within each class. There was no time limit, but students were expected to spend no more than a class period, or about 45 minutes, on the questionnaire.

Because the questionnaire was organized into 30 groups of items, each consisting of 10 related items, the omitted items were expected to occur in groups of ten. The numbers of students responding to common sets of items, even with the option to skip, were expected to be large enough to permit factoring of the items. If the factor structures were similar enough to indicate that similar inferences could be made about common student perceptions, whether items were skipped or not, and if other difficulties did not appear, the option to skip would be retained in the final form of the questionnaire.

The results were equivocal. Even with grouping of related items, the numbers of students completing common sets of items were too small to permit reasonable results from a factor analysis. In another sense, though, the option to skip clearly failed in that most of the students who had the option to skip simply omitted the last third of the items. The assumption that the students would judiciously select the items to which they would respond was unsupportable.

Several reasons can be offered for the failure of the item-skipping option to produce better information in a limited amount of time. For the selection process to work, some procedure must be provided for the students to scan the total body of content of the questionnaire. The initial instructions, and the brief descriptions of the general content of each item group, may have been too vague to let students make sensible decisions about which item groups to exclude. The grouping of the items, which was done on the basis of appearance of similarity of content rather than on any empirical basis, may have been inconsistent with student perceptions and might have confused rather than facilitated item selection.

Finally, the lay-out of the questionnaire, with 30 pages and 10 items per page, may have interfered with the expeditious overview of the content that would be necessary for sensible selection.

If economy in administration time is important, improved procedures for grouping items and for permitting selective responses may be worth further exploration. If factor analysis should reveal a consistent underlying structure in the questionnaire, the items could be grouped in terms of factors, those consistently showing the highest loadings appearing first. After responding to the three or four items with the highest loadings on a factor, the student could be instructed to omit the remaining items in that group, unless he considered that topic particularly important. The item groups might then be assembled into the total questionnaire in order of decreasing importance of the content to the persons administering the questionnaire. The students' tendency to omit more items toward the end of the questionnaire would then concentrate the responses on the more important items.

On the other hand, the saving in respondents' time and the extension of the content covered may not be great enough to justify the complications introduced by the option to skip items. A set of items may be found that is both small enough and comprehensive enough that skipping items may not be necessary with reasonable administration time. The difficulties in interpreting data in which large gaps exist, even when the gaps are imposed rationally, may be too high a price to pay for economies in administration time. In any case, the effort with Student Reactions to College was unsuccessful.

Effects of different numbers of response categories

The items ask the students to indicate their attitudes, experiences, and preferences. The responses called for can range from a dichotomous, Yes-No,

response to a more finely graded response indicated by a choice of one from among any number of ordered categories. The optimal number of response categories depends on a number of interacting considerations. The reliability of multiple-item scales, for example, is not appreciably affected by the number of response categories (Matell & Jacoby, 1971), except when the reliability is low to begin with (Komorita & Graham, 1965) or the comparison is between two response categories and any larger number (Bendig, 1954).

These conclusions do not necessarily apply, however, when the information of interest is in multiple responses to individual items. The potential amount of information in an item, whether treated individually or as an element in a multiple-item scale, increases with an increase in the number of response categories (Garner, 1962). Yet most respondents are unable to use more than about nine categories effectively and, depending on the nature of the item, may be able to use no more than five (Miller, 1956). Validity has rarely been studied in relation to the number of response categories (Matell & Jacoby, 1971).

Considerations other than reliability and validity also enter into determination of the optimal number of response categories. Low response time per item may be associated with a high effect of response set (Trott & Jackson, 1971). The acceptability of the items to the respondents may vary with the number of response categories (Strahan, 1971). Whether the items refer to the respondents personally or to nonpersonal or external content may also affect the way the items function (Rundquist, 1966).

Since the items of the present questionnaire were not intended to be combined into multiple-item scales, and since the basic information was to apply to the institution rather than to individual respondents, questions of

scale reliability were not appropriate. Different numbers of response categories could affect the time required to complete the questionnaire, student acceptance of the questionnaire, and the meaning of the response. To examine these effects, three abbreviated forms of the questionnaire, each consisting of the same items but with different numbers of response categories, were administered to a total of 558 students at City College of San Francisco. The identical numbers of students in the two format trials was the result of happenstance. Groups of approximately 600 were desired.

Each form of the questionnaire consisted of the same 70 items that had been selected randomly from the total number of items on the questionnaire. One form asked for a two-category (No-Yes) response. A second form added an intermediate, uncertain category labeled with a question mark. The third form provided five response categories labeled Definitely Not, No, ?, Yes, Definitely Yes. The three forms were distributed haphazardly within a set of social science classes, approximately equal numbers of each form being completed in each class. No time limit was imposed, but the students all started on signal and recorded, to the nearest minute, the time they spent completing the questionnaire.

Response time did not differ appreciably among the three response formats. The mean times to complete the three 70-item forms were 9.2, 10.2, and 10.4 minutes for the two-category, three-category, and five-category forms.

To examine the three response formats for differences in the meanings implied by the responses, the three sets of items were factored. If the meaning in a set of responses to an item is unaffected by the number of response categories provided, the pattern of relationships among a group of items, or their factor patterns, should also be unaffected. The factor patterns of the three sets of items were examined to arrive at subjective judgments of similarity. The patterns

for the three-category and five-category response formats appeared quite similar, while the two-category factor pattern seemed clearly different from the other two. Since the groups of students completing each form were quite similar, being enrolled in the same classes and being undifferentiable with respect to age, sex, program in which enrolled, and several other characteristics on which they provided information, the response format is the most likely source of the difference in factor patterns.

On the two-category and three-category forms, a common practice of the students was to place asterisks or exclamation marks beside some of their responses, a practice that did not occur on the five-category form. This suggests that many students want the opportunity, provided with five response categories, to express particularly strong views about selected items.

In summary, the increase in response time required for the five-category form relative to the other forms was small--about 13 per cent more than that required for two categories and 2 per cent more relative to the three-category form. The two-category form, forcing the students to make a gross decision of some sort, seems to lead to somewhat different interpretations of the items than do either of the response formats that allow an uncertain response. Finally, some students seem to value the opportunity to give particularly strong responses that is provided by the five-category form. For these reasons, the final form of the questionnaire provided for five categories of response except where the content of the item made a smaller number more appropriate. The items asking about the frequency with which some event had occurred, for example, were kept in the three-category form.

VI. Trial Administrations

Extensive interviews, conferences, discussions with students and junior college staff members, trials to compare formats, and editing sessions produced a set of items that seemed likely to provide information pertinent both to students and to their colleges. Whether the items would ultimately be useful, however, could be determined only with actual use. In the spring of 1971, therefore, a variety of junior colleges around the country were asked to administer the questionnaire to several hundred students. From these student responses in a variety of college settings the following information was desired:

a. Item response distributions for different colleges and different student subgroups.

b. Inter-item correlations in different colleges and different student subgroups.

c. Definition of student subgroups recurring in several colleges that are identifiable by particular response patterns rather than by the usual variables for student grouping, such as sex, age, and field of study.

Each of these kinds of information will be discussed more fully in the presentation of the results.

An opportunity was provided in the trial questionnaire for students to write in issues of importance to them that were not adequately covered in the 203 items of the questionnaire. The write-in provisions were not left for the end of the questionnaire, but were provided with each of 24 sets of items dealing with a common area, such as the scheduling of classes or administrative requirements. If a student had additional comments in the same area as the set of items to which he had just responded, he had a space where he could write them in immediately.

Sample of colleges and students

The major consideration of the selection of colleges was that they include a wide diversity of students and educational settings. Since the questionnaire was to serve as a vehicle for students to describe their experiences at their own colleges, norms representing either students or colleges would be of little use. Careful sampling from a defined population of colleges was relatively unimportant. Some indication of the variation in item response patterns to be expected across different kinds of students in different colleges, however, was considered important and led to the desire for diversity.

Examination of the distributions of junior college characteristics across the entire population of almost 1,000 junior colleges in the country showed that a group of about 24 colleges could be selected that would provide broad representation across the spectrum of college characteristics. Public and private, large and small, rural and urban, transfer oriented and occupationally oriented, as well as other distinguishing features could all be represented within a group of 24. While these features could not be treated independently of each other in a group that size--since qualities like small size, rural locations, and private control would tend to occur together--each feature would have an opportunity to be observed in the student responses.

The colleges asked to participate were individually selected to provide the desired range of characteristics. Of 56 colleges that were asked, 27 participated, providing 6,495 completed questionnaires.

By design, most of the colleges were in California, Texas, Illinois, and North Carolina, four of the five states having the largest number of junior colleges and two-year technical institutes. Also by design, six colleges were

in states having limited numbers of junior colleges, most of the six located where they constituted the only local institution of higher education. The participating colleges are listed in Appendix A-1.

Enrollments in the colleges range from less than 500 to more than 17,000 students with a mean enrollment of around 4,450. While most have coed student bodies with a moderate overrepresentation of men, two are predominantly for women and four predominantly for men. These and other college characteristics are tabulated in Appendix A-2.

The percentages of full-time students range from 32 to 100 per cent. A third of the colleges have more than half of their students attending part-time. Freshmen comprise 48 to 82 per cent of the student body, with about a third of the colleges having three-fourths of their students in first-year courses. Evening students vary from none to 63 per cent, with about half the colleges having a fourth or more of their students in the evening division. Veterans constitute from 2 to 30 per cent of the students, with half of the colleges having at least 10 percent of their students veterans.

The colleges have offered post-high school courses for from 1 to 170 years; 10 opened before 1940 and 10 after 1960. Most are publicly controlled, but one is a private, independent college and another is church-related. Seven of the colleges are isolated geographically from other public colleges and provide the only local access to higher education. Others are located within commuting distance (usually 40 miles or less) of from 1 to 20 public junior colleges and from 1 to 7 public four-year colleges. Five of the colleges are in suburbs of large metropolitan areas, four in cities of 500,000 or more, three in cities of from 50,000 to 500,000, 8 in smaller cities and 7 in communities of less than 10,000 or in rural areas.

In half of the colleges at least 60 per cent of the courses carry transfer credit. The percentages of students in transfer programs range from 10 to 82 per cent, with half of the colleges having at least 40 per cent of their students in a program that does not transfer to four-year colleges.

The faculty-student ratio ranges from 1:11 to 1:73. Two-thirds of the colleges have at least one faculty member for every 25 students. The cost of college to local residents ranges from nothing to $640 in tuition per academic year with an average cost of $145. A third of the colleges have no tuition. Tuition for out-of-state students is from $126 to $1200 a year with an average cost of $525.

While a number of these characteristics are related, such as the rurual colleges tending to be small, all the indicated characteristics are encompassed in the sample of 27 colleges, assuring substantial diversity.

About 200 students was considered the minimum sample size that would give adequate representation to various subgroups within a college's student body. More than 200 students seemed necessary in larger, more complex colleges. The numbers of completed questionnaires requested from each college therefore took the following pattern according to size of student body: 200 completed questionnaires from colleges with fewer than 2,000 students; 250 from colleges with 2,000 to 5,000 students; 300 from those with 5,000 to 10,000 students; 400 from colleges with more than 10,000 students. However, since participation in the trial administrations was voluntary, a college was free to involve any number of students. The numbers completing the questionnaire at a single college ranged from 65 to 433, with a mean sample size of 240.

For the trial administrations, where statistical representativeness of the student body in any institution was less important than the inclusion of a variety of points of view, nonrandom selection of classes with assurance of variety was a permissible approach, although random selection was encouraged.

The colleges were free to choose their classes in whatever ways were most convenient, but a reasonable representation of the various types of students--college-transfer, part-time, evening, first-time students, etc.--was requested. The range of students and problems within a college was to be fostered by the selection of classes that varied with respect to level, time of day, academic or nonacademic character, and subject matter.

In general, the questionnaire was administered in 10 to 25 classes in each college. The colleges were encouraged to select enough classes randomly from a list of all the classes given the current term, excluding very large classes, to provide the desired number of completed questionnaires. No student was to be asked to complete the questionnaire twice, and no instructor was to have more than one class involved in the administration. There was no fixed time limit, but participating instructors were asked to allow an entire class session, or at least 45 minutes, a time limit within which at least 90% of the students were expected to finish.

Response Distributions

The most fundamental information in the results of the trial administrations was in the response distributions of the individual items, since this was to be the basis for reporting results to users. The most desirable response distributions were presumed to be those that were neither flat, with responses uniformly distributed over the response range, nor concentrated in a single response category. On the other hand, neither a flat nor a concentrated distribution would necessarily be undesirable without additional indications that the item was not providing useful information. The results of the trial administrations that provided the response distributions are given in Appendix B.

Flat response distributions. A flat response distribution for an item would occur in either of two situations. Student experiences and perceptions might vary so much with respect to that item that no single response would be any more characteristic of the college than any other. For some items, such as those concerning student plans, a flat response distribution might usefully indicate the diversity of those plans. For many items, though, such as those involving an assessment of some aspect of the instructional program, a definite clustering of student views in one or perhaps two adjacent response categories would provide less ambiguous information. Alternatively, a flat response distribution might indicate that the item was itself ambiguous and subject to a number of different interpretations, leading students to respond for a variety of reasons across all response categories.

Neither flat nor heavily concentrated distributions appeared in large numbers. Of the 203 items, 132 provided five response categories in the form: Definitely Not--No--?--Yes--Definitely Yes. The remaining 71 items, referring to specific experiences, were in a three-category format: Not at All--Once or Twice--3 Times or More.

Of the five-category items, those for which the most heavily chosen category had no more than 33 per cent of the responses (twice as many as the average of the other four categories) would have shown a relatively strong tendency for students to scatter their judgements over the range of possible responses. Out of 132 five-category items, 23 (17 per cent) fell within that criterion for uniformity of distribution. For the revised version of the questionnaire, 6 of these items were dropped, 5 were reworded to clarify and sharpen their meaning, and 12 were left unchanged in the belief that true variability in student perceptions rather than ambiguity was the reason for the flat response distribution

and that the information provided would be useful to the college in spite of the absence of any modal student view.

An example of an item dropped is "Without the regulations this college would be like a jungle." The absence of any experiential referent was thought the most likely reason for the flat response distributions, and the item was dropped. To that item, 10 per cent of the students responded "Definitely Not" and 12 per cent "Definitely Yes;" 30 per cent said "No" and 23 per cent "Yes". While that degree of response variability indicates that the item conveys more information, in a technical sense, than one with a more concentrated set of responses, the information conveyed seems more likely to be associated with the personality traits of the students responding than with their college experiences.

One of the items retained was "I've lost time toward a BA degree because some of the courses I've taken won't count in a four-year college." The responses to this item were distributed very nearly like those to the item in the previous paragraph, but it refers to reasonably specific experiences. Determination by the college of the kinds of students who say "Yes" to this item could lead to direct ameliorative action.

Among the items with three response categories, those having fewer than 40 per cent of the responses in a single category were examined for ambiguity. Only two such items were found and both were dropped from the final version.

Peaked response distributions. In contrast to the items having flat response distributions were those in which a predominant proportion of students gave a common response. The informational value of items with low response variability is limited. Yet even items with their capacity for the communication of information limited by low response variability may be valuable because of the

importance of the limited information they do provide. For example, the item, "This term I have dropped a course because it wasn't giving me what I wanted," was answered "No" by 71 per cent of the total group of students. Yet even though affirmative responses were relatively uncommon, that information should be valuable to colleges in examining further the characteristics of the students and courses to which the item applies.

As an arbitrary rule of thumb, items were selected for further examination when 70 per cent or more of the responses to a three-category item fell in a single category, and 50 per cent or more for the five-category items. Among the 71 items with three response categories, 15 fit the adopted criterion of an excessively peaked response distribution. Five of these 15 were deleted from the revised version of the questionnaire and two were rewritten to increase the variability of response. The remaining 8 were thought to provide valuable information in spite of their limited range of response.

A similar examination of the 132 five-category items showed 17 with at least 50 per cent of the responses in a single category. Ten of these items were deleted and five reworded.

Items evoking uncertain responses. The 132 items with five response categories had the middle category labeled "?". For 6 of these items, 40 per cent or more of the responses appeared in the middle category. Four of these six were deleted and the other two were reworded either to clarify their meaning or to make them apply to more specific experiences. An additional 13 items had from 30 to 39 per cent of their responses in the uncertain middle. Two of these were deleted and all the remaining 11 were reworded.

Frequently omitted items. The final characteristic of the response distributions examined was frequency of omission. The proportion of omissions increased

regularly from the beginning to the end of the questionnaire, varying closely around 1.5 per cent for the first 80 items, rising to around 3 per cent at about the 90th item, to 5 per cent at the 130th item, and reaching 12 per cent by the 200th item. The omission rate at the 150th item, the length of the final version of the questionnaire was about 7 per cent.

Six items showed omission rates markedly higher than those of the items around them in the questionnaire, indicating that the students either had unusual difficulty responding to those items or objected to them. Four of these six were deleted from the questionnaire and the other two were rewritten to improve their acceptability.

Staff Reactions and Student Write-ins

Many of the staff members responsible at each college for coordinating the trial administrations provided information about the reactions of students and faculty members to the questionnaire. They generally confirmed the belief that the questionnaire was pertinent to educational problems in junior colleges and that the range of possible issues of importance had been covered reasonably well. Nevertheless, many students took full advantage of the invitation to add their own write-in items. Both staff and student comments were given lengthy consideration in revising, deleting, and adding items.

The most common negative comment was that the questionnaire was too long, even though it had been pared to 203 items from an earlier version of 300. Some students needed more than 45 minutes to complete the questionnaire, and some instructors resented having to give up so much class time.

Some students and faculty objected mildly that some items were not relevant to their particular college. For example, one instructor wondered "what constitutes a make-up course?"

At one college "the students seemed to have no problems in filling out the forms and as the day wore on and the students were aware of what they would be doing in class that day, the attendance in class was not influenced adversely. As a matter of fact, some instructors indicated that it might have been a little bit better than it would have had they lectured."

A few of the colleges reported that the accordion-like form was confusing to some students. The questionnaire consisted of 12 pages printed on the front and back of a single sheet 6 pages wide. Folded up, the form could be completed as a book except that at the end of page 6, the form had to be turned over. The number of students omitting items increased somewhat at the beginning of page 7, indicating either some confusion with the questionnaire format or dismay at finding so much more to be completed.

One of the coordinators reported possible bias associated with administering the questionnaire in class. In scanning through the completed questionnaires from each class, he found "a remarkable consistency in the vehemence of the views and kinds of comments expressed by students in particular classes." Each class's set of questionnaires gave him "a distinct impression of the atmosphere and instructor-student relationship in that class." For example, several extremely critical comments were expressed in one class; none at all in another. He also noticed "the care with which students completed the questionnaire: in some classes, most were carefully and neatly done; in others (primarily those with bitter comments), they tended to be untidy and incomplete."

Although the questionnaire is intended to elicit responses about students' college experiences, the responses should not be dominated by the students' reactions to the particular class in which they complete the questionnaire. Clarifying the instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire, or administering

it outside a class setting, may minimize this tendency. It may also be capitalized on, however, with sufficient attention to the classes chosen for administration of the questionnaire.

VII. The Final Questionnaire

Examination of the response distributions from the trial administrations, students' write-in items and comments, and a final review by a group of junior college faculty members, administrators, and students led to the elimination of 86 of the 203 items of the trial version. Forty new items were written and 53 were reworded, making a total of 157 items in the final questionnaire (Appendix C). A table showing corresponding items in the trial and final versions appears as Appendix D.

Content

The items can be classified by content into the following categories. To some extent this is arbitrary, since some items that could be placed in more than one category have been counted only in the category that seemed primary. Some of the items classified under Instruction, for example, could also be placed under Faculty/Staff Contact with Students. Nevertheless, the following classification scheme does reflect the emphases of the questionnaire.

Instruction (48 items). These items are concerned primarily with student experiences in the classroom, with observations about the nature of the course-related experiences and of the teaching styles of the instructors. The orientation of the courses and student preferences for different teaching procedures are also included.

Studying (14 items). Though closely related to instructional activities, these items are classified separately because they deal with the students' own efforts and activities independent of their instructors. They are concerned with studying procedures, use of the library, and the students' sense of academic effectiveness.

Other groups of items based on related content could be formed that would cut across these categories. Counseling services are one important area touched on by items in several categories. Student estimates of their own academic performance is dealt with in both of the first two categories. Other categories, with fewer items, can also be formed within some of the nine broad categories. Student views on grading and credit, placement in classes, relations with other students, and academic advising are all examples of topics touched on by several items.

One of the criticisms of the questionnaire expressed by faculty members and administrators was that it was too negative in tone. Attempts were made from the beginning to balance the wording of the items so that roughly equal numbers would be stated favorably and unfavorably. "My instructors have been easy to talk to" is an example of a favorably worded item. "My instructors have taught their courses like high school courses" is worded unfavorably. Some important statements about students' college experiences were difficult to put in a favorable form, however, without twisting them into an awkward construction. "I have been sent from one office or person to another trying to get information" is an example of an unfavorably worded item that could be made favorable only by wording it negatively, which would lead to an awkward double negative in the responses of students who had not experienced that kind of administrative runaround. In the final version, 43 per cent of the items are unfavorable statements about the college in the form in which they are stated; 28 per cent are favorable statements; 29 per cent are neutral statements referring to situations that are neither favorable nor unfavorable in general.

Response format

Write-in comments and reactions of student consultants suggested that the content of some of the items was not appropriate to either a Yes-No response or a response indicating the number of times an event had occurred. Some items, such as "My instructors have been easy to talk to", are more appropriately responded to along a dimension consisting of Almost never--Sometimes--Often--Almost always. This four-level response was therefore provided for 46 of the 157 items.

The items in the trial version asking how often an event had occurred, such as "Did badly on a quiz or exam," had been provided with three response categories, Not at all--Once or twice--Three times or more. The highest category of these three consistently had relatively few responses, the median being 14 per cent. The median usage of the middle category was 37 per cent. To spread the responses, the three categories for these items were labeled in the final version, No--Yes, Once--Yes, twice or more. This distinction between a single occurrence of an event and two or more occurrences, besides spreading the responses, seemed more appropriate for many of the items than a distinction between one or two occurrences and three or more. Such an item would be "Had to buy a textbook that was not really necessary." Of the 157 items in the final questionnaire, 42 were given the three response categories from No to Yes, twice or more; 42 were given the four categories from Almost never to Almost always; 73 were given the five categories from Definitely not to Definitely yes.

A final modification was made in the response format to accommodate those students who indicated with write-in comments some frustration over being unable to respond to items that were not appropriate at their colleges. "Not applicable" was provided as an option for 20 of the 157 items. It was not provided for the other 137 items to prevent its being used indiscriminately.

Optional procedures for administration

The standard form of the questionnaire provides 12 items for classifying student respondents. These consist of age, sex, field of study, and other variables commonly used to classify students. They do not include items that would provide information on high school performance or parental characteristics such as education, occupation, or income. The decision not to include such background items was made in spite of strong arguments for their importance by several consultants to the project.

The major reason for excluding variables on high school and family background was that many junior college students are returning to a formal educational setting after having been dissatisfied or unsuccessful or both in their prior educational experiences. They are adults going to college because they choose to, and many of them find questions asking about their parents' characteristics or high school experiences demeaning, or at best irrelevant. For the 25 per cent of entering junior college freshmen who are 21 years or more of age, and the 12 per cent of all junior college students who are 25 or older (Bushnell & Zagaris, 1972), neither high school record nor parental characteristics are particularly informative.

While such information is valuable for some purposes and for some students, those purposes need not be served by this particular questionniare. The accommodation to student sensitivities in omitting such items seems far more important in preventing student rejection of the questionnaire than does the inclusion of all the kinds of student information that may be useful for whatever purposes.

Nevertheless, provision has been made for colleges, at their option, to add 10 items, each with 5 levels of response. These locally written items can ask for information on student background characteristics, student self-ratings,

or additional aspects of their college experiences not covered in the questionnaire. They will be tabulated and reported to the college with the other questionnaire items. They can also be used to group students, with results for the remainder of the questionnaire reported separately for those groups.

A second option permits the college to ask for the students' names or identification numbers. While the standard form will not have this provision, because of a concern for student anonymity described earlier, situations may exist in which student identification is necessary. The User's Manual will describe ways to avoid identifying students while still accomplishing some of the purposes for which student identification is used, but that option will be available when necessary.

Reports

Reports to the college will consist basically of the distribution of responses of all the students to each of the 157 content items, the 12 student classification items, and as many of the 10 locally written items as are used. Difficulty in absorbing or interpreting this amount of data makes breakdowns into subgroups of students and items almost essential. A variety of ways are available to group the data into small sets of manageable size and related content. The most desirable ways have not yet been determined, and they are likely to vary in cost. Some of the possible reporting procedures are described below as illustrative examples.

Selection of subgroups to be reported might be based on cross-tabulations, as when a college might ask for six subgroups on two categories of sex and three categories of age. The distributions for a relatively few items of particular

interest to the college might be provided for a larger number of student groups or for selected groups for whom the items have particular relevance. For example, a college might want responses to those items concerned with classroom procedures, such as grading practices, class organization, and teaching styles, provided for a variety of student groups. Or items found in the trial administration to differentiate minority students from other students might be examined for student groups formed according to race. An example is an item expressing a desire for more study facilities on the campus, which was responded to affirmatively by minority students more commonly than others. The user's manual will report items found previously to differentiate among particular student groups so college users will be able to make sensible selections from among the items.

Factors found consistently across a variety of colleges and student groups will also be reported in the user's manual. Those items with high loadings on factors of particular interest to a college might be examined for selected groups of students.

Two additional procedures might be followed by a college in selecting items for which it might request response breakdowns by student groups. One procedure would select those items to which large proportions of students gave extreme responses, indicating particularly strong or definite feelings. A second procedure would select those items on which the students at a particular college showed response distributions that deviated substantially from the response distributions commonly found.

All these possibilities for examining particular groups of items for particular groups of students suggest that a valuable reporting procedure would be one that was broken down into two stages. The first report might consist only of the total response distributions to all the items plus three or four student groups. After examining these results, the college might then specify additional response distributions on selected items for selected student groups.

Relative costs of these various reporting procedures have not yet been estimated and will of course be a major factor in determining which procedures will be most appealing to the users. Whatever the relative costs may be, though, some one or more ways of breaking the data down by item groups and student groups is essential. The mass of data represented by response distributions to 157 items is far too great to be readily usable.

A first step toward breaking down the total mass of data will be to report item response distributions in clusters of related items. These clusters should probably be based on factor analyses of item responses across a large heterogeneous group of students across a variety of colleges. Such analyses have been completed for the trial administration data and can provide a useful basis for grouping the items. The changes in the questionnaire since the trial administrations, however, make new analyses desirable with data from early administrations of the latest version of the questionnaire.

VIII. Summary

The process that led to the final form of Student Reactions to college started with K. Patricia Cross's contention that junior college students were a valuable under-utilized source of information about the effectiveness of junior college programs. With financial support from the College Entrance Examination Board, a large number of interviews were conducted with students and staff of junior colleges across the country to determine the kinds of information considered important that students could provide.

Analysis and discussion of the interview results at two conferences of junior college experts provided guidelines for development of a questionnaire, jointly underwritten by the College Board and ETS, that would provide the desired vehicle for students to express their views of their junior college experiences. Items were written reflecting the content and emphasis brought out in the interviews. Several tentative forms for presenting and organizing the items were attempted and abandoned before the trial version was produced for a widespread administration.

Two issues of form were tested at West Valley College in Campbell, California, and at City College of San Francisco before the trial version was set. First a tentative plan to present a large number of items with instructions to the students to skip any items that were of little importance to them was abandoned when it appeared that location toward the end of the questionnaire rather than importance was the dominant reason students skipped items. Second, where the item content justified a multiple-category response format, five response categories seemed to be preferred by students and required only a negligible amount of additional time compared with two-category responses. Further, factor

analyses indicated somewhat different meanings in the items with either a five-category or three-category response compared with two-category items.

A form consisting of 203 items plus provisions for write-in items and comments was completed in the late spring of 1971 by 6,495 students at 27 junior colleges. Examination of the response distributions, further review by an advisory group, and incorporation of some of the recurrent write-in comments led to item deletions, revisions, and additions. The resulting questionnaire consists of 157 items.

Almost a third of the items in the final form of the questionnaire are concerned with some aspect of the students' classroom instruction. Smaller numbers of items deal with student goals and planning, student activities, administrative problems, out-of-class studying, various aspects of daily living such as housing and transportation, financial concerns, and student-staff contact. Colleges will be able to learn from the ways students respond to these items what student expectations are not being met, what instructional procedures are causing difficulty for students, which kinds of students need particular kinds of help, what program changes would be well received by the students, and in general, a variety of ways in which the college's programs and the students' needs are and are not congruent.

The results of administering the questionnaire to a sample of students will be reported to a college broken down by groups of items and groups of students. Those issues identified by the college as of primary importance will be emphasized in the report to prevent the users from having to deal with a large body of unorganized information. Secondary analyses of the results will be possible after the initial report has been examined by the college. Procedures for administering the questionnaire and for making the most effective use of the results will be presented in a user's manual.

References

Bendig, A.W. Reliability and the number of rating scale categories. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1954, 38, 38-40.

Bushnell, D.S., & Zagaris, I. Report from Project Focus: Strategies for change. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972.

Congressional Record, June 24, 1969.

Cross, K.P. The junior college student: A research description. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Garner, W.R. Uncertainty and structure as psychological concepts. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Komorita, S.S., & Graham, W.K. Number of scale points and the reliability of scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1965, 25, 987-995.

Matell, M.S., & Jacoby, J. Is there an optimal number of alternatives for Likert scale items? Study I: Reliability and validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31, 657-674.

Miller, G.A. The magical number seven, plus or minus two. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 81-97.

Rundquist, E.A. Item and response characteristics in attitude and personality measurement: A reaction to L. G. Rorer's "The great response-style myth." Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 66, 166-177.

Strahan, R. Subject satisfaction with questionnaire assessment a function of response format. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971, Vol. 6 (Pt. 1), 125-126.

Trott, D.M. & Jackson, D.N. An Experimental analysis of acquiescence. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1967, 2, 278-288.

Appendix A-1

Participating Colleges

California

- Diablo Valley College
- Hartnell College
- Imperial Valley College
- Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
- Monterey Peninsula College
- Orange Coast College
- Reedly College
- Sacramento City College

Texas

- Amarillo College
- College of the Mainland
- El Centro College
- Galveston College
- Laredo Junior College
- Southwest Texas Junior College

Illinois

- College of DuPage
- Moraine Valley Community College
- Olive-Harvey College
- Southeastern Illinois College

North Carolina

- Central Carolina Technical Institute
- Isothermal Community College
- Mitchell College

Other States

- Bismarck Junior College, North Dakota
- New Mexico Junior College
- Oterc Junior College, Colorado
- Ricks College, Idaho
- Vermont Technical College
- Vincennes University, Indiana

Characteristics of Colleges in the Trial Administrations

(Figures are numbers of colleges)

Location	
California	8
Texas	6
Illinois	4
North Carolina	3
Colorado	1
Idaho	1
Indiana	1
New Mexico	1
North Dakota	1
Vermont	1

Age of college in 1971	
3 years or less	2
4 - 9 years	7
10 - 25 years	7
26 - 60 years	9
More than 60 years	2

Enrollment	
Over 10,000	4
5,000 - 10,000	5
2,000 - 4,999	6
1,000 - 1,999	7
Under 1,000	5

Tuition per year	
To local student:	
No tuition	10
$50 - $120	6
$121 - $200	6
Over $200	5
To out-of-state student:	
Less than $225	4
$225 - $425	11
$426 - $800	7
Over $800	5

Size of college community	
Less than 6,000	5
8,000 - 35,000	10
50,000 - 150,000	3
More than 500,000	
In city	4
In suburb	5

Control of college	
Local	15
Some state	10
Church	1
Private, independent	1

Faculty-student ratio	
Less than 1:15	3
1:15 - 1:22	9
1:23 - 1:30	10
More than 1:30	5

Percentage of courses transferable to senior colleges*	
80 - 100	5
60 - 79	9
40 - 59	8
00 - 39	4

Percentage of full-time students	
80 - 100	8
53 - 79	8
40 - 52	8
00 - 39	3

Percentage of freshman students	
76 - 100	8
66 - 75	9
55 - 65	7
00 - 54	3

Percentage of male students*	
70 - 100	4
58 - 69	11
46 - 57	9
00 - 45	2

Percentage of students in transfer programs**	
80 - 100	3
60 - 79	12
40 - 59	7
00 - 39	3

Percentage of evening students**	
46 - 100	3
26 - 45	10
10 - 25	8
00 - 09	4

Percentage of veterans*	
20 - 100	2
13 - 19	6
06 - 12	8
00 - 05	7
unknown	3

Number of public colleges within 40 miles

	Two-year colleges	Four-year colleges	Two-year and Four-year colleges
None	8	8	7
1 to 3	6	12	4
4 to 10	7	7	10
11 to 20	6	0	0
More than 20	0	0	6

*No data for one college.
**No data for two colleges.

Appendix B-1

STUDENT REACTIONS TO COLLEGE

Response Distributions for 27 Colleges

Spring 1971

Figures are percentages of a total of 6,495 students (excluding nonrespondents) who gave each response. Figures in parentheses are the extreme values among the 27 colleges.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT SAMPLE

1. Sex

Male	59	(40--99)
Female	41	(1- 60)

2. Age

Under 18	1	(0-- 4)
18 - 19	44	(25--77)
20 - 21	23	(11--36)
22 - 24	13	(2--21)
25 - 29	9	(1--18)
30 - 39	7	(0--16)
40 - 59	3	(0-- 8)
60 or older	0	(0-- 1)

3. Marital status

Single	76	(58--99)
Married	21	(1--38)
Widowed, divorced or separated	3	(0--10)

4. Living with parents

Yes	61	(28--86)
No	39	(14--72)

5. Employment

Not employed	42	(19--58)
Employed part-time	44	(33--58)
Employed full-time	15	(1--41)

6. Ethnic group

Red, American Indian, Native American	3	(0-- 9)
Black, Afro-American	10	(0--73)
Brown, Chicano, Mexican-American, Latino, Hispano-American	12	(0--77)
Yellow, Asian, Oriental	4	(0--17)
White, Caucasian	71	(18--97)

7. When do you have your classes?

Day only	76	(36--96)
Evening only	5	(0--38)
Day and evening	18	(3--41)

8. For how many class hours or credit hours are you enrolled?

Less than 8	11	(0--50)
8 - 11	11	(0--19)
12 - 15	37	(7--49)
More than 15	41	(12--92)

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

9a. How many previous semesters (or quarters) have you been at this college?

None; this is my first	13	(2--34)
One	39	(9--76)
Two or more	49	(18--86)

b. How many at another college?

None	78	(64--90)
One	9	(4--17)
Two or more	13	(3--28)

10. Have you served for 90 days or more on active duty in the armed services of the United States?

No	81	(65--96)
Yes	19	(4--35)

11. What is your major course or field of study?

Undecided	10	(0--24)
Applied arts (photography, fashion, interior design)	2	(0-- 5)
Fine arts (sculpture, theater, music)	3	(0--13)
Business (accounting, marketing, secretarial, hotel and restaurant services)	19	(2--35)
Communications (broadcasting, journalism, public relations, advertising)	1	(0-- 4)
Public services (police science, public administration, social welfare, transportation)	4	(0--15)
Behavioral sciences (sociology, psychology, anthropology)	5	(0--16)
Social sciences (economics, political science, history)	4	(0-- 8)
Physical sciences (chemistry, biology, mathematics, physics)	4	(0-- 9)
Natural resources (agriculture, landscape technology, wildlife management)	3	(0--13)
Engineering or architecture	5	(1--27)
Technology (data processing, engineering technology, drafting, optics)	7	(1--35)
Trade and industry (auto mechanics, plumbing, carpentry, machinist)	5	(0--33)
Home Economics (clothing and textiles, dietetics, home management)	1	(0-- 3)
Personal services (food technology, cosmetology, child care)	1	(0-- 5)
Health services (medical technician, nurse, physical therapist)	8	(0--26)
Education (elementary, secondary, special)	10	(0--30)
Liberal arts and humanities (languages, literature, ethnic studies, philosophy)	3	(0-- 8)
Other	6	(2--22)

12. What does your program usually lead to eventually?

Four-year or higher degree	57	(2--80)
Two-year degree	26	(3--76)
Certificate	6	(1--33)
Neither a degree nor a certificate	1	(0-- 3)
Uncertain	10	(1--15)

STUDENTS' IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES

	Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
I. During the present school term I have . . .			
1. done badly in a quiz or exam because I was taking too many courses	58 (41--72)	35 (24--47)	7 (0--13)
2. got a grade (on a test, paper, or other class work) that I couldn't understand the reason for	57 (35--74)	37 (24--53)	6 (2--14)
3. participated in a course-related activity with non-students off the campus	79 (65--86)	15 (7--26)	7 (3--13)
4. had an instructor who geared the course to the students' interests or abilities	19 (7--27)	55 (40--67)	26 (13--39)
5. talked for at least 10 minutes with an instructor outside of class about coursework	24 (5--38)	44 (34--56)	32 (22--55)
6. had an instructor who could not explain things in a way students could understand	30 (13--48)	55 (43--68)	15 (8--28)
7. had a course that I thought would be dull made interesting by the instructor	23 (15--32)	63 (55--71)	13 (6--17)
II. During the past two weeks I have . . .			
9. been bored in class	18 (4--29)	46 (39--56)	36 (22--54)
10. been in a class session where the instructor was no more help than just reading the text would have been	33 (10--49)	45 (35--59)	22 (12--37)
11. had an instructor make something clear that I'd had trouble understanding before	13 (3--20)	56 (41--67)	31 (20--45)
12. been in a class that just went over material I already knew	44 (27--53)	47 (37--57)	9 (4--19)
13. felt left behind in a course	45 (32--59)	44 (34--55)	12 (4--20)
14. been unable to understand what was being taught in class	44 (26--55)	42 (34--54)	14 (10--22)
15. participated in a class discussion	16 (3--29)	43 (33--55)	42 (26--63)

IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES

		Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
16.	been in a class discussion that touched on a current social problem	28 (15--39)	42 (37--54)	29 (18--48)
17.	felt frustrated because the class wasn't moving fast enough	60 (39--74)	31 (21--48)	9 (5--18)
18.	had a class assignment that was really only busy-work	43 (23--62)	41 (29--55)	16 (5--27)

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
III.	In general . . .					
20.	I can't tell how well I'm doing in a course until I get a grade on a test or paper	15 (7--22)	32 (27--40)	18 (12--23)	29 (20--42)	6 (2--11)
21.	the best teachers teach the required courses	20 (8--29)	35 (19--46)	27 (18--37)	15 (5--36)	4 (1--16)
22.	the courses I've taken have been right up to date	3 (0-- 7)	18 (9--27)	18 (10--28)	52 (38--65)	9 (3--16)
23.	the instructors do more than just put out the material and leave it up to me to get it	4 (1-- 6)	16 (8--22)	14 (7--20)	54 (45--63)	13 (4--26)
24.	the instructors treat students the same, whether they agree with the instructor's point of view or not	8 (1--15)	21 (11--33)	17 (12--25)	45 (37--56)	10 (2--19)
25.	most of the instructors I've had make their courses relate to problems of society whenever possible	3 (0-- 8)	19 (11--31)	17 (11--28)	53 (45--67)	8 (1--14)
26.	a lot of the courses I've taken are too much like high school courses	12 (3--20)	45 (28--52)	13 (8--20)	22 (13--33)	8 (3--23)
27.	the instructors I've had are pretty clear about what they expect of students	3 (0-- 4)	11 (5--20)	12 (6--25)	59 (50--69)	15 (4--29)
IV.	I would like . . .					
29.	more group assignments for class projects so students can learn from each other	8 (3--15)	30 (20--42)	18 (8--22)	37 (26--50)	8 (3--18)
30.	at least one course based on independent study worked out on my own with an instructor	5 (3--10)	24 (18--31)	21 (14--34)	39 (27--49)	10 (4--20)
31.	the good students and the slow students put in separate classes	18 (7--26)	41 (29--55)	16 (12--25)	18 (10--33)	6 (3--14)

IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES

	Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
32. grades based more on day-to-day work than on a few big exams or papers	3 (1-- 7)	16 (8--25)	11 (6--17)	45 (36--54)	24 (13--36)
33. no grades given except Pass or Fail	21 (8--35)	30 (17--44)	14 (8--32)	20 (12--29)	15 (6--25)
34. no grades at all; just written comments by my instructors	21 (12--34)	37 (24--51)	19 (13--25)	15 (8--28)	8 (2--14)
35. more classes without texts or assignments, organized around informal discussions	8 (1--14)	26 (15--34)	16 (10--20)	37 (26--58)	13 (8--23)
36. more small, informal seminars, even if they met less often with the instructor	5 (1--10)	22 (9--29)	22 (16--32)	41 (30--51)	10 (5--26)
37. student fees used to compile and distribute student evaluations of teachers each year	5 (0--11)	21 (14--33)	30 (23--40)	34 (23--43)	10 (4--16)
38. the faculty to spend more time in office hours and informal meetings with students even if they taught fewer, but larger classes	8 (3--15)	34 (22--47)	23 (16--30)	28 (19--40)	7 (2--11)
V. The faculty should . . .					
40. see that their courses don't move so fast that the slower students are left behind	3 (0-- 7)	16 (5--22)	15 (9--22)	51 (46--64)	16 (7--27)
41. assign no failing grades; credit should just not be given for courses taken but not passed	8 (2--20)	22 (9--34)	19 (15--25)	35 (25--43)	16 (7--32)
42. stay with topics that have caught the class's interest even if they don't cover the planned amount of ground in the course	6 (0--13)	31 (18--50)	14 (8--20)	38 (28--52)	11 (5--18)
43. work out the course content with the students in each class, even if some courses don't mesh very well with the next ones in the sequence	6 (1--10)	27 (19--44)	25 (20--33)	37 (28--49)	5 (2--11)

STUDENTS' CONCERNS ABOUT THEIR OVERALL COLLEGE PROGRAMS AND THEIR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

		Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
VI.	During the present school term I have . . .			
45.	talked with my adviser for 15 minutes or more	38 (13--54)	45 (34--63)	18 (11--37)
46.	looked through occupational information to learn about job possibilities when I finish school	42 (21--62)	37 (25--45)	21 (11--38)
47.	asked a student for advice about what courses to take	34 (16--66)	46 (27--58)	20 (8--34)
48.	wondered whether the courses I was taking were really what I wanted	26 (11--44)	45 (40--55)	28 (13--42)
49.	taken some tests that helped me decide what kind of courses I want	76 (67--91)	20 (6--27)	4 (1-- 9)
50.	dropped a course because it wasn't giving me what I wanted	71 (53--90)	26 (10--41)	3 (0-- 8)
51.	talked with a counselor about my future plans	50 (26--66)	39 (25--57)	11 (6--23)
52.	been unable to take a course I wanted because I didn't have the prerequisites	70 (51--88)	26 (10--41)	4 (0-- 9)
53.	been unable to get help I needed with course planning from a counselor or adviser	75 (60--87)	21 (12--35)	5 (1-- 9)
54.	taken a required course I didn't want	31 (17--57)	55 (39--68)	15 (4--21)
55.	spent course time in or observing an actual job situation	71 (38--85)	21 (11--42)	8 (2--22)
56.	got bad information about programs or courses from a college staff member	77 (56--90)	20 (9--36)	4 (1-- 8)

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
VII.	In general . . .					
58.	if I knew better what I wanted to do I could get more out of college	9 (3--17)	19 (10--27)	12 (6--16)	38 (30--48)	22 (12--32)
59.	I may have to change my major because I'm not doing too well in the one I'm in	32 (18--48)	42 (31--51)	14 (8--24)	10 (3--16)	2 (1-- 5)
60.	there aren't enough courses for me that have much to do with life outside college	13 (5--22)	35 (22--43)	23 (18--31)	22 (15--30)	7 (4--11)

CONCERNS ABOUT COLLEGE PROGRAMS AND THE FUTURE

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
61.	in the program I'm in, the courses are pretty standard; there's not much question about what to take	5 (2-- 9)	18 (8--32)	15 (3--26)	48 (30--62)	14 (3--50)
62.	I can't wait to finish and get out	7 (3--15)	22 (13--31)	16 (10--24)	27 (20--35)	28 (17--38)
63.	my courses are pretty closely tied to my future job plans	5 (1-- 8)	16 (7--26)	19 (7--30)	39 (29--45)	21 (6--37)
64.	I'm pretty sure about what I want to do when I finish here	6 (1--15)	16 (8--26)	14 (6--22)	41 (24--51)	24 (14--36)
65.	I've lost time toward a BA degree because some of the courses I've taken won't count in a four-year college	12 (6--23)	32 (15--44)	19 (7--27)	27 (15--37)	11 (6--33)
66.	my occupational plans have changed since I started here	17 (10--28)	40 (26--48)	10 (5--18)	25 (15--35)	8 (2--17)
67.	the required courses are good because they keep me from being limited to courses in my major field	10 (5--14)	23 (16--28)	25 (19--37)	37 (19--45)	6 (1-- 9)

VIII. I would like . . .

69.	a different field of study that had more definite job possibilities	9 (3--22)	37 (28--48)	21 (15--28)	27 (13--37)	6 (3--10)
70.	to change my field of study if it wouldn't delay my finishing here	15 (7--27)	49 (39--58)	16 (8--26)	17 (9--26)	4 (0-- 7)
71.	more information about job requirements and possibilities instead of just my own vocational test scores	3 (1-- 9)	14 (8--22)	15 (9--21)	51 (41--66)	17 (11--24)
72.	practical experience in actual job situations even if it takes me longer to finish	4 (1-- 9)	16 (10--28)	14 (9--20)	47 (39--58)	19 (12--30)
73.	more class experiences out in the community even if they are outside class time	3 (0-- 8)	23 (16--37)	18 (12--24)	47 (32--55)	10 (4--14)
74.	more information about four-year college and graduate school possibilities and requirements	2 (0-- 8)	15 (5--35)	10 (3--16)	52 (38--65)	21 (7--35)
75.	more courses related to ethnic issues	6 (1--12)	23 (15--35)	31 (24--44)	32 (23--46)	7 (2--14)
76.	student fees raised to provide better information about courses and program requirements	19 (6--28)	41 (31--53)	22 (16--31)	16 (0--23)	3 (0-- 7)
77.	student fees raised to bring in outside people with up-to-date information about jobs	13 (7--25)	27 (17--35)	21 (16--26)	32 (23--41)	7 (3--10)

CONCERNS ABOUT COLLEGE PROGRAMS AND THE FUTURE

	Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
IX. The college should . . .					
79. cut out some of the required courses (like physical education or a foreign language) that are not related to a student's field	7 (3--12)	21 (9--35)	10 (5--17)	37 (30--49)	25 (13--43)
80. give students what they want now instead of putting so much emphasis on four-year college requirements	4 (1-- 8)	21 (13--34)	18 (9--26)	42 (24--51)	15 (7--24)
81. leave to employers and students the problem of job information	21 (15--38)	51 (39--62)	13 (8--18)	12 (6--18)	3 (1-- 6)
82. give more emphasis to job training and less to preparation for transfer to a four-year college	7 (2--12)	27 (15--36)	24 (15--30)	32 (23--45)	11 (4--22)
83. make it easier for students to try different programs when they aren't sure what they want to do	1 (0-- 2)	4 (1--11)	12 (6--17)	65 (45--79)	18 (9--34)
84. push students to make a definite decision about their school and job plans	28 (16--40)	44 (36--59)	12 (3--18)	13 (7--25)	3 (0-- 8)

STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES IN STUDYING FOR COURSES

	Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
X. During the present term I have:			
86. got help on coursework from a faculty member outside class	49 (17--63)	39 (28--55)	12 (6--37)
87. done badly in a quiz because I didn't have time to study	33 (23--52)	50 (39--59)	17 (8--24)
88. spent two hours or more studying with two or more other students	56 (20--79)	30 (17--44)	15 (5--38)
89. helped another student with his studies	27 (8--50)	52 (40--66)	21 (9--47)
90. been unable to get a library book I needed because it was checked out	55 (29--71)	32 (23--45)	13 (5--33)
91. used a book from the library that I otherwise would have had to buy	48 (33--67)	37 (26--47)	15 (6--22)
92. been unable to use the library when I needed to because it wasn't open	71 (48--88)	20 (9--36)	8 (3--19)
93. spent half a day or more studying on a week-end	25 (16--36)	38 (28--48)	37 (24--51)
94. found I couldn't understand what I was studying even though I understood it earlier in class	33 (18--46)	51 (38--65)	16 (11--30)
95. got help studying from another student	32 (5--56)	51 (36--62)	17 (8--40)
96. took time I should have spent in one course to catch up in another	19 (6--38)	57 (48--71)	24 (13--41)
97. spent an evening studying even though I didn't have to	38 (31--46)	45 (37--52)	17 (8--26)

	Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
XI. In general . . .					
99. the best teachers teach the special or "make-up" courses	7 (3--16)	34 (27--48)	47 (31--57)	10 (3--28)	2 (0-- 8)
100. my instructors expect more outside work than I have time for	4 (2-- 7)	38 (25--46)	14 (9--21)	33 (24--44)	11 (3--21)
101. I have to study so hard just to keep up that I haven't time to relax and enjoy college	8 (3--18)	46 (32--54)	15 (11--19)	23 (13--31)	10 (4--14)

STUDYING FOR COURSES

	Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
102. special courses here do a good job pulling weak students up to where they can handle the regular courses	3 (0-- 6)	10 (4--17)	45 (16--65)	35 (19--53)	7 (1--18)
103. my ability to study has improved since I came here	5 (1-- 8)	20 (9--31)	15 (8--20)	45 (37--55)	15 (7--25)
104. I have trouble concentrating on what I'm supposed to be studying	4 (0-- 8)	29 (21--39)	15 (8--23)	41 (32--49)	11 (5--17)
105. I have so much reading to do that I don't have time to really understand it	5 (1--12)	38 (22--51)	14 (7--20)	31 (21--39)	12 (4--21)
106. I can get all my studying done in time to do whatever else I want to do	11 (3--19)	39 (32--51)	15 (11--21)	31 (20--40)	4 (1-- 8)
107. by the time I find I need help, I'm too far behind to catch up	6 (2--13)	49 (38--60)	19 (12--28)	21 (12--30)	4 (0-- 7)

XII. The college should . . .

109. provide more space and facilities for students to study on campus by enlarging class sizes and using the classroom space released	7 (2--12)	32 (19--57)	24 (13--33)	31 (11--50)	7 (0--16)
110. put more library books on a one-day circulation basis so they would be more available	(2--13)	33 (22--50)	28 (13--36)	29 (19--38)	6 (1--12)
111. pay for more copies in the library of the books most often used by charging for them by the day	9 (4--18)	37 (27--51)	26 (20--30)	24 (15--40)	4 (0-- 9)
112. give more class time to special courses for students who have trouble with the regular courses	2 (0-- 5)	12 (7--22)	24 (15--40)	53 (32--66)	10 (3--18)
113. organize tutoring and study help for all students who want it	1 (0-- 2)	4 (1-- 9)	10 (3--16)	60 (48--71)	25 (15--45)

STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES WITH THE COLLEGE'S REGULATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

	Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
XIII. During the present term I have . . .			
115. spent an unnecessary amount of time standing in line or filling out forms	43 (6--66)	43 (25--55)	14 (5--53)
116. missed a class session because of problems getting registered	74 (42--95)	22 (5--44)	4 (0--14)
117. taken a course I didn't really want because the one I wanted wasn't available	46 (23--84)	44 (15--60)	11 (1--21)
118. been kept from something I wanted to do by an unnecessary or inappropriate regulation	56 (35--75)	34 (18--46)	10 (3--25)
119. disregarded a campus regulation	61 (22--80)	29 (14--46)	10 (2--37)
120. been angered by something the college administration did	49 (13--72)	37 (22--48)	14 (5--38)
121. found the campus police helpful	73 (41--92)	23 (7--46)	4 (0--14)
122. taken fewer courses than I had planned because of scheduling problems	61 (37--90)	32 (10--51)	7 (0--15)

	Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
XIV. In general . . .					
124. registration procedures have been no real burden for me	14 (8--29)	34 (28--39)	12 (4--18)	32 (23--46)	8 (4--15)
125. by the end of the first week or two of school, my class schedule was pretty well settled	2 (0-- 6)	6 (1--13)	4 (1-- 8)	73 (67--81)	15 (8--25)
126. a required course given only once a year, that I couldn't get when I wanted it, may hold me back	8 (3--16)	37 (25--52)	16 (7--21)	29 (20--39)	10 (4--16)
127. I have had no trouble getting the courses I want here	11 (4--17)	36 (31--44)	12 (8--21)	33 (24--45)	7 (4--10)
128. administrative policies here are seldom unreasonable	6 (1--13)	23 (14--33)	30 (13--43)	36 (20--51)	5 (1--12)
129. student publications are too tightly controlled by the administration	7 (1--13)	33 (18--49)	36 (15--51)	17 (6--25)	7 (1--19)
130. the student government gets students the kind of non-academic program they want	9 (4--18)	23 (12--37)	50 (33--66)	16 (7--31)	2 (0-- 4)

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
131.	the atmosphere here is pretty relaxed; there are no real hassles about rules	7 (1--21)	15 (8--32)	15 (8--20)	53 (29--66)	10 (5--24)
132.	without the regulations, this college would be like a jungle	10 (5--18)	30 (13--46)	24 (13--33)	23 (11--33)	12 (4--22)
133.	administrative errors have caused problems for me	13 (5--19)	49 (37--56)	16 (9--23)	16 (10--29)	6 (1--15)

XV. The college should . . .

135.	cut down the time students spend filling out forms by using more electronic data processing for routine administrative work	2 (0-- 7)	20 (4--36)	28 (13--38)	39 (20--54)	12 (1--33)
136.	set up more sections in required courses even if the number of elective courses has to be cut down	10 (5--19)	34 (23--48)	23 (12--32)	27 (17--41)	5 (1--15)
137.	arrange class enrollment procedures that would get my class schedule settled by the first day of class even if that made later changes difficult	4 (1-- 8)	32 (20--41)	28 (19--36)	32 (24--47)	4 (1-- 7)
138.	add several days at the beginning of the term to allow students more time with their advisers	3 (1-- 8)	23 (14--42)	18 (8--27)	47 (28--60)	8 (2--18)
139.	let as many students as want to take any class with any instructor, even if some classes became huge	13 (4--23)	47 (36--61)	13 (7--18)	22 (14--37)	5 (2-- 9)
140.	prevent nonstudent radicals and agitators from speaking on campus	15 (6--26)	34 (22--48)	17 (13--24)	19 (10--32)	15 (5--22)
141.	enforce campus regulations more firmly	10 (5--25)	43 (29--58)	27 (13--37)	16 (6--31)	4 (0--10)
142.	let any student group organize and meet on campus without the administration's permission	16 (7--22)	44 (34--56)	17 (9--25)	18 (7--34)	6 (1--12)
143.	take disciplinary action against students for illegal off-campus activity	25 (9--43)	39 (24--50)	16 (8--22)	15 (6--39)	6 (2--16)
144.	permit outside police on campus whenever violence occurs	10 (4--20)	15 (6--26)	16 (10--27)	42 (27--57)	18 (8--31)
145.	periodically review, with students, administrative procedures like registration, enrollment, withdrawal from class, etc.	2 (0-- 5)	10 (5--29)	21 (14--27)	54 (41--65)	14 (6--22)

STUDENTS' LIVING CONDITIONS

		Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
XVI.	During the present term I have . . .			
147.	missed a class because I couldn't get a babysitter	93 (87--100)	5 (0--11)	2 (0-- 5)
148.	skipped lunch or dinner because it took so long and I had to get to class	50 (34--83)	30 (14--36)	20 (3--32)
149.	missed a class assignment because I didn't have money for the books or other supplies needed	70 (52--88)	23 (10--36)	7 (0--13)
150.	moved to a different place to live	84 (73--96)	14 (4--24)	2 (0-- 6)
151.	cut a class because of an outside problem	30 (12--43)	50 (41--58)	20 (12--33)
152.	spent more than $25 for clothes	35 (23--49)	39 (32--48)	27 (10--39)
153.	missed a class because of a transportation problem	58 (44--81)	32 (14--40)	10 (3--18)
154.	spent several hours trying to find part-time or temporary work	58 (48--72)	26 (14--34)	16 (7--25)
155.	thought seriously about dropping out because of lack of money	71 (56--81)	19 (11--35)	10 (4--19)
156.	skimped on food because I didn't have enough money	59 (45--76)	24 (13--33)	17 (5--29)

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
XVII.	In general . . .					
158.	the prices and quality of food on the campus are good enough so I eat there fairly often	22 (2--39)	30 (9--44)	20 (9--35)	24 (6--51)	4 (0--29)
159.	transportation problems make it hard for me to get part-time and temporary jobs	22 (13--34)	48 (35--61)	10 (3--15)	14 (5--31)	6 (2-- 9)
160.	the cost of college has been more than I expected	12 (4--23)	45 (23--62)	9 (3--15)	25 (14--41)	9 (2--28)
161.	I have had no problems finding acceptable housing near the college	15 (6--23)	33 (25--44)	28 (7--41)	19 (12--35)	6 (0--10)
162.	my family, job, classes, and studying keep me so busy I don't have time for anything else	8 (5--18)	41 (31--60)	10 (6--17)	26 (11--34)	15 (6--23)
163.	where I live, I feel cut off from the campus	11 (4--29)	46 (38--52)	12 (5--17)	24 (5--33)	8 (1--13)
164.	I have had to buy textbooks that were not really necessary	5 (0-- 9)	24 (8--44)	7 (2--10)	43 (31--54)	22 (11--44)

LIVING CONDITIONS

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
165.	I could use some help finding a part-time or temporary job	11 (4--22)	35 (25--48)	11 (7--16)	28 (16--40)	15 (7--23)
166.	living with my parents presents problems that outweigh the advantages	18 (9--25)	38 (28--50)	21 (14--37)	14 (10--22)	9 (2--13)
167.	I will have to leave school for a while to earn money	21 (8--28)	46 (32--57)	16 (11--23)	12 (5--21)	5 (2-- 9)
XVIII.	The college should . . .					
169.	give students a bigger role in deciding what services will be paid for out of student fees	2 (0-- 8)	11 (6--27)	21 (14--28)	52 (30--63)	13 (5--30)
170.	take more responsibility for getting loans for students	2 (0-- 5)	10 (5--20)	22 (11--32)	53 (42--73)	14 (6--24)
171.	hire students and student spouses for the college's clerical and maintenance jobs	1 (0-- 4)	5 (2--13)	15 (8--22)	60 (48--75)	19 (11--31)
172.	use money from student fees to run an office where students can get advice on problems like the draft, housing, controlling living expenses, social activities, etc.	3 (0-- 7)	11 (6--25)	17 (8--22)	50 (43--62)	18 (10--25)
173.	set minimum housing standards for landlords who rent to students	3 (1-- 7)	12 (7--21)	17 (6--25)	50 (40--64)	19 (7--35)
174.	train and pay students to help professional counselors work with student problems	2 (0-- 5)	9 (3--19)	19 (11--27)	56 (46--68)	15 (5--23)
175.	cut out unessential but compulsory student costs, such as those for student activities, athletics, the student newspaper, etc.	7 (3--13)	28 (22--41)	22 (12--30)	31 (21--41)	12 (5--18)
XIX.	I would like . . .					
177.	more places on campus to relax or study between classes, even if classroom space has to be used	3 (0-- 6)	26 (10--44)	17 (7--26)	41 (26--64)	12 (3--25)
178.	advice and help keeping living costs down	2 (0-- 6)	20 (11--30)	17 (9--28)	49 (36--64)	12 (3--23)
179.	childcare centers provided on or near the campus	4 (2--10)	20 (8--41)	33 (23--45)	33 (14--44)	10 (3--22)
180.	textbooks I could rent so I wouldn't have to buy so many	2 (0-- 7)	14 (6--29)	12 (5--21)	50 (42--62)	21 (11--34)
181.	help in forming car pools with other students	4 (1-- 8)	28 (19--44)	27 (18--40)	32 (14--41)	9 (4--15)

STUDENTS' INTERPERSONAL EXPERIENCES ON CAMPUS

		Not at all	Once or twice	3 times or more
XX.	During the present term I have . . .			
183.	felt that a college staff member didn't understand what I was saying	38 (21--57)	51 (38--61)	11 (4--20)
184.	gone to a meeting or social activity of a school organization	43 (9--74)	37 (21--54)	20 (5--61)
185.	got help from a faculty or staff member with a problem I was having in college	44 (27--63)	45 (32--56)	11 (5--20)
186.	gone to a meeting or activity organized by an ethnic group at the college	73 (52--95)	21 (3--36)	6 (1--12)
187.	made a serious suggestion to a faculty or staff member about how something at the college could be improved	60 (33--73)	33 (22--54)	7 (2--13)
188.	been sent from one office or person to another trying to get information	41 (15--57)	45 (34--56)	14 (8--40)
189.	attended a meeting or lecture on the campus about a problem our society is facing	53 (23--83)	37 (16--59)	10 (2--20)
190.	felt bitter or angry about the lack of sensitivity of the college faculty or staff	56 (28--74)	33 (19--45)	11 (6--27)
XXI.	In the past two weeks I have . . .			
192.	talked with an instructor casually about things not connected with class	33 (16--44)	49 (41--62)	18 (13--27)
193.	met someone at school I hope to get to know better	21 (8--35)	53 (41--61)	26 (11--48)
194.	spent time between classes talking with other students	6 (1--12)	30 (17--40)	65 (48--81)
195.	got into an interesting activity going on at the college	56 (25--75)	29 (19--41)	15 (5--38)

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
XXII.	In general . . .					
197.	I have no trouble getting the information I need about school	7 (3--13)	33 (25--43)	20 (12--27)	36 (27--48)	4 (0-- 8)
198.	my instructors are available outside class at times convenient to me	5 (0--10)	21 (12--32)	19 (8--26)	48 (38--62)	5 (2--11)

INTERPERSONAL EXPERIENCES

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
199.	a lot of the activities most students like don't appeal to me	4 (1-- 8)	32 (20--52)	26 (15--34)	33 (21--46)	5 (2-- 8)
200.	a lot of faculty and staff members just don't hear what minority students try to tell them	6 (1--12)	25 (16--36)	37 (25--49)	25 (13--39)	6 (1--13)
201.	students here are usually involved in the administrative decisions that affect them	8 (1--18)	26 (16--36)	38 (16--53)	26 (14--39)	3 (0-- 7)
202.	most of the people I spend time with outside class are other students	5 (0--14)	22 (2--37)	7 (2--12)	50 (32--70)	15 (7--33)
203.	I've found a real acceptance of different racial groups at the college	5 (2--13)	16 (6--28)	27 (18--46)	43 (22--57)	9 (5--17)
204.	a handful of students run things here	9 (4--17)	28 (17--37)	32 (15--52)	23 (13--37)	9 (3--21)
205.	instructors are easy to talk with	2 (0-- 5)	10 (4--16)	15 (3--23)	62 (53--70)	11 (3--26)
206.	I'm pretty much like most of the other students here	5 (2--12)	17 (10--25)	16 (8--25)	57 (45--69)	6 (3--12)
207.	it's very hard for students to get their concerns known and acted on	2 (0-- 4)	24 (12--41)	34 (21--49)	34 (15--48)	6 (1--14)
208.	my social life is outside school	2 (0-- 7)	13 (3--49)	10 (5--16)	54 (31--65)	21 (5--34)
209.	the student government does a good job getting student needs taken care of	9 (1--24)	20 (12--35)	45 (17--65)	24 (9--36)	2 (0-- 6)
210.	students here are given the respect and responsibilities of adults	6 (1--23)	15 (5--37)	22 (8--32)	51 (37--63)	6 (1--13)
211.	minority students face a lot of problems in the college that other students don't have	8 (3--14)	31 (21--41)	34 (23--50)	22 (13--32)	5 (1--13)
212.	organized social activities at the college are not necessary because there are enough things going on in the surrounding area	16 (6--48)	38 (29--47)	28 (7--39)	15 (5--25)	3 (0-- 6)
213.	I've had instructors here who had trouble understanding what the students' problems were	3 (0-- 8)	26 (16--40)	23 (13--32)	40 (27--53)	8 (3--18)
214.	organized ethnic groups on the campus have had a big impact	8 (2--26)	30 (16--45)	44 (24--60)	16 (3--32)	3 (0--10)

INTERPERSONAL EXPERIENCES

		Definitely not	No	?	Yes	Definitely yes
XXIII.	The college should . . .					
216.	provide more facilities for ethnic groups	6 (2--10)	22 (13--37)	44 (35--59)	24 (14--33)	4 (0--10)
217.	offer more courses and programs for people in the community who are not regular students	2 (0-- 5)	14 (4--23)	23 (16--33)	54 (42--71)	7 (3--15)
218.	recruit more students from minority groups	5 (2-- 9)	20 (9--38)	36 (23--46)	33 (13--47)	6 (1--11)
219.	provide more activities for special groups of students instead of campus-wide activities	5 (1-- 9)	28 (15--46)	31 (15--41)	31 (24--41)	4 (0-- 9)
220.	abandon any attempts to control students' out-of-class activities	5 (2--14)	23 (14--46)	22 (13--33)	34 (15--42)	16 (7--30)
221.	give more attention to serving the community and less to sending students on to advanced education	15 (7--39)	40 (30--58)	24 (14--30)	17 (8--26)	4 (1-- 7)
XXIV.	I would like . . .					
223.	more organized social events	3 (0-- 7)	20 (7--35)	25 (12--39)	42 (26--59)	10 (3--25)
224.	more activities geared to married students or older students	3 (1-- 6)	23 (13--37)	36 (25--44)	32 (18--40)	6 (0--13)
225.	student-faculty "encounters"	2 (0-- 6)	11 (5--16)	29 (13--37)	49 (41--62)	10 (4--26)
226.	the activities fee dropped; I can take care of my own activities	5 (2--14)	26 (14--56)	26 (15--42)	30 (11--44)	12 (1--23)

ED 072101

Appendix C-1

STUDENT REACTIONS TO COLLEGE

Directions

This questionnaire is intended to give students a systematic way of saying what is important in their college experiences. What is valuable and what is not? What is going well in college and what needs changing or improving?

Since the important results are in what groups of students say, identification of individual students is not necessary. Don't put your name on the questionnaire, but please complete the items below so the results can be organized to show how views of the college differ for different groups of students. Individual questionnaires will not be examined by anyone at the college, the total set of questionnaires will be sent to Educational Testing Service for tabulation.

(Alternate paragraph: Please print your name (and social security/ identification number) in the space below and black in the circles so a machine can read it. This is necessary to let the results get coordinated with other information, such as academic performance or changes in major field, or to see how your views of the college may change as changes occur in the college. Nothing in the questionnaire will enter your academic record in any way or will affect how your performance is judged.)

T 002 2

A. Sex:

Male ( )
Female ( )

B. Age:

Under 18 ( )
18 - 19 ( )
20 - 21 ( )
22 - 24 ( )
25 - 29 ( )
30 - 39 ( )
40 - 59 ( )
60 or older ( )

C. Marital Status:

Single ( )
Married ( )
Widowed, divorced, or separated ( )

D. Living with parents?

Yes ( )
No ( )

E. Employment:

Not employed ( )
Employed part time ( )
Employed full time ( )

F. Ethnic group (Please check only one):

Afro-American ( )
Black ( )
Negro ( )
American Indian ( )
Asian ( )
Oriental ( )
Brown ( )
Chicano ( )
Hispano-Americano ( )
Latin-American ( )
Latino ( )
Mexican-American ( )
Puerto Rican ( )
Caucasian ( )
White ( )
Other: _____ ( )

G. When do you have your classes?

Mostly mornings ( )
Mostly afternoons ( )
Mornings and afternoons ( )
Mostly evenings ( )
Days and evenings ( )

H. For how many credit hours are you enrolled?

Less than 9 ( )
9 - 11 ( )
12 - 15 ( )
More than 15 ( )

I. 1. How many previous semesters (or quarters) have you completed at this college?

None ( )
One ( )
Two or more ( )

2. How many at another college?

None ( )
One ( )
Two or more ( )

J. Have you served for 90 days or more on active duty in the armed services of the United States?

No ( )
Yes ( )

K. What is your major field or course of study? Please mark the one field that seems closest to yours. Examples are given in parentheses.

1. Undecided ( )
2. Agriculture ( )
3. Natural resources other than agriculture (ecology, forestry, landscape technology, wildlife management) ( )
4. Applied arts (photography, fashion, interior design) ( )
5. Fine arts (sculpture, theater, music) ( )
6. Architecture ( )
7. Business (accounting, marketing, secretarial, hotel and restaurant services) ( )
8. Communication (broadcasting, journalism, public relations, advertising) ( )
9. Behavioral sciences (psychology, sociology, anthropology) ( )
10. Social sciences (economics, history, political science) ( )
11. Public services (police science, public administration, social welfare, transportation, planning) ( )
12. Biological sciences (biology, botany, physiology) ( )
13. Physical sciences (chemistry, physics, geology) ( )
14. Mathematics, statistics ( )
15. Engineering ( )

16. Technology (data processing, engineering technology, drafting, optics) ( )
17. Trade and industry (auto mechanics, plumbing, carpentry, machinist) ( )
18. Health services (medical technician, nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy) ( )
19. Personal services (cosmetology, child care) ( )
20. Home economics (clothing and textiles, dietetics, home management) ( )
21. Education (elementary, secondary, special) ( )
22. Liberal arts and humanities (languages, literature, ethnic studies, philosophy) ( )
23. Other: _____ ( )

L. What does your program usually lead to eventually?

Four-year or higher degree ( )
Two-year degree ( )
Certificate or diploma ( )
No formal educational goal ( )
Uncertain ( )

Please mark only one choice for each statement on the following pages. Try to respond to every statement. Since different groups of statements have different lead-in phrases and ask for different kinds of response, be sure you stay with the labels at the top of each column of circles. The "Not Applicable" response should be used only where a circle is provided for it.

	Not Applicable	Almost never	Some-times	Often	Almost Always
This term my instructors have . . .					
1. been available outside class at times convenient to me		( )	( )	( )	( )
2. been easy to talk to		( )	( )	( )	( )
3. had trouble understanding what the students' problems were		( )	( )	( )	( )
4. geared their instruction to the students' interests and abilities		( )	( )	( )	( )
5. been unable to explain something in a way I could understand it		( )	( )	( )	( )
6. respected student points of view that were different from their own		( )	( )	( )	( )
7. presented more in class than I learned from reading the text		( )	( )	( )	( )
8. really listened to student questions and discussions in class		( )	( )	( )	( )
9. done more than put out the material and leave it to me to get what I can		( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Almost never	Some-times	Often	Almost Always
This term my instructors have . . .					
10. treated all their students equally		( )	( )	( )	( )
11. been clear about what they expect of students		( )	( )	( )	( )
12. piled on the work as though theirs is the only course I have		( )	( )	( )	( )
13. allowed students a reasonable amount of freedom in the way course assignments are carried out		( )	( )	( )	( )
14. returned exams and papers with grades, corrections, or comments soon enough to be helpful	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. given detailed comments about papers, exams, or other material I've turned in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. treated students as if they were supposed to know as much as the instructor		( )	( )	( )	( )
17. been right up to date in what they were teaching		( )	( )	( )	( )
18. taught their courses like high school courses		( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	No	Yes, once	Yes, twice or more
During the present term I have . . .				
19. participated in a course-related activity off the campus		( )	( )	( )
20. talked about course work for at least 15 minutes with an instructor outside of class time		( )	( )	( )
21. done badly on a test		( )	( )	( )
22. got help on coursework from a faculty member outside class		( )	( )	( )
23. had to buy a textbook that was not really necessary		( )	( )	( )
24. helped another student study		( )	( )	( )
25. been unable to use the library when I needed to because it wasn't open	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. had to spend time learning or relearning math that I should have known		( )	( )	( )
27. got help studying from another student		( )	( )	( )
28. had to go through a long, senseless administrative process because I wanted or did something out of the ordinary	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. been sent from one office or person to another trying to get information	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	No	Yes, once	Yes, twice or more
During the present term I have . . .				
30. been inconvenienced by an administrative error		( )	( )	( )
31. talked with an instructor about things not connected with class		( )	( )	( )
32. talked with an adviser for 15 minutes or more	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. asked a student for advice about what courses to take		( )	( )	( )
34. looked through occupational information to learn about job possibilities for when I finish school		( )	( )	( )
35. taken tests to decide what kind of courses to take		( )	( )	( )
36. tried unsuccessfully to get help from a counselor or adviser		( )	( )	( )
37. been given wrong information about programs or courses by a college staff member		( )	( )	( )
38. gone to a meeting of a college organization or to an organized social activity at the college		( )	( )	( )
39. gone to a meeting or activity organized by an ethnic group at the college		( )	( )	( )
40. faced a problem involving housing, a job, sources of financial aid, transportation, or something else connected with going to college that the college should have helped me with but didn't		( )	( )	( )

During the present term I have . . .	Not Applicable	No	Yes, once	Yes, twice or more
41. missed a class assignment because I didn't have money for the books or other supplies I needed		( )	( )	( )
42. looked seriously without success for part-time or temporary work		( )	( )	( )
43. thought seriously about dropping out because of lack of money		( )	( )	( )
44. been faced with unexpected costs connected with college that have made problems for me		( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Almost never	Some-times	Often	Almost always
This term I have . . .					
45. known how well I was doing in my courses before I got a grade		( )	( )	( )	( )
46. had class assignments that were really only busy-work		( )	( )	( )	( )
47. been bored in class		( )	( )	( )	( )
48. been in a class that just went over material I already knew		( )	( )	( )	( )
49. felt left behind in a class		( )	( )	( )	( )
50. been unable to understand what was being taught in class		( )	( )	( )	( )
51. felt frustrated because the class wasn't moving fast enough		( )	( )	( )	( )
52. had trouble concentrating on what I was supposed to be studying		( )	( )	( )	( )
53. had so much reading to do that I didn't have time to really understand it		( )	( )	( )	( )
54. been able to get help with studies when I've needed it	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
55. found I couldn't understand what I was studying even though I understood it earlier in class		( )	( )	( )	( )
56. felt bitter or angry about the lack of sensitivity of a member of the college faculty or staff		( )	( )	( )	( )
57. had problems getting to and from the campus		( )	( )	( )	( )

	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
would like . . . or like the present arrangement that provides . . .					
58. course assignments where several students work together	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
59. at least one course based on independent study with an instructor	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
60. the fast students and the slow students taught in separate classes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
61. grades based on day-to-day work more than on a few big exams or papers	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
62. end-of-course grades that tell me how well I did compared with other students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
63. infrequent small classes more than frequent large classes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
64. classes that stay on the course schedule instead of following student interests	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
65. at least one course in which I am not graded	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
66. courses organized around a variety of source material, not just a single text	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
67. courses I could get credit for by studying on my own and passing an exam	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes

I would like . . .
or
I like the present arrangement that provides . . .

68.	practical experience in actual job situations even if it takes me longer to finish	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
69.	class experiences out in the community or away from the college	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
70.	a student-run office, supported by student fees, for advice on housing, the draft, living expenses, drugs, contraception, and other nonacademic concerns of students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
71.	organized social activities	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
72.	cultural events on campus--art exhibits, theater, concerts, etc.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
In general . . .						
73. I'm doing well in my major field	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
74. I know what I want to do when I finish here		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
75. I've lost time toward a BA or BS degree because some of the courses I've taken won't count in a four-year college	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
76. my occupational plans have changed since I started here		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
77. I know as much as I need to know about four-year colleges and their requirements		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
78. the college is set up to give me pretty much what I want		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
79. I've never learned to study well enough to handle the work in the time I should		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
80. student publications are too tightly controlled by the administration	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
81. the rules and regulations are pretty relaxed here; nobody feels hassled		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
82. the faculty and staff listen when minority students tell them something	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
In general . . .						
83. rules and regulations that affect me are made by the administration without enough consultation with students		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
84. students here have a reasonable role in deciding what services are paid for from student fees	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
85. a handful of students run things here		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
86. students here don't care about much except getting through with college		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
87. the campus is a place where students just go to class; not much else happens here		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
88. food services on the campus are adequate for my needs		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
89. I have had problems getting acceptable housing	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
90. where I live I feel cut off from the campus		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
91. the college does as much as it can to hire students or their spouses in its clerical and maintenance jobs		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
92. I will have to leave school for a while to earn money		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
93. I'm uncertain about what I'm getting from college		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
94. I would change my field of study if I wouldn't be delayed finishing						

		Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
This term . . .							
95.	the campus has been a friendly, comfortable place to be		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
96.	registration procedures were a real burden		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
97.	I got the courses I wanted		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
98.	the struggle and chaos of getting started lasted too long into the term		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
99.	there's a close connection between my courses and what I want to do when I leave		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
100.	required courses in my major field kept me from taking other courses I would have liked	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
101.	I'm here for the classes; I don't need the non-curricular activities		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
102.	costs of books and supplies have been a problem		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
103.	I've seen a real acceptance of students from racial minorities at the college	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
104.	organized ethnic groups have had a big impact on the campus	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Almost never	Some-times	Often	Almost Always
In general . . ,					
105. I've had trouble knowing what courses to take		( )	( )	( )	( )
106. it's very hard for students here to get their concerns known and acted on		( )	( )	( )	( )
107. the administrative policies here are reasonable		( )	( )	( )	( )
108. students here are given the respect and responsibility of adults		( )	( )	( )	( )
109. minority students face a lot of problems in the college that other students don't have	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
110. information about what's going on at school has been easy to get		( )	( )	( )	( )
111. the organized student activities have appealed to me		( )	( )	( )	( )
112. the student government has done a good job with things important to me	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
113. I feel unsafe on the campus after dark	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
114. I feel unable to lay down a book or anything else on campus for fear it will be stolen		( )	( )	( )	( )
115. classes, studying, and a job have kept me too busy for anything else		( )	( )	( )	( )

	No	Yes, one	Yes, two or more
This term I have . . .			
116. dropped a course because it wasn't what I wanted	( )	( )	( )
117. been kept out of a course I wanted because I didn't meet the requirements	( )	( )	( )
118. taken a course I didn't want or need because the course I wanted was closed	( )	( )	( )
119. stayed out of a course I wanted because the books or supplies would have cost too much	( )	( )	( )
120. had to take a course below the level of one I wanted and could have handled	( )	( )	( )
121. been trapped by rigid drop and add requirements in a course I found I didn't need or want	( )	( )	( )
122. been prevented by scheduling problems from taking a course required in my field	( )	( )	( )
123. missed a course I need because it wasn't given	( )	( )	( )
124. taken a course mainly for my own satisfaction in learning what it offered	( )	( )	( )
125. taken a required course that's been a waste of time	( )	( )	( )
126. had an instructor who consistently came to class unprepared	( )	( )	( )

This term I have . . .	No	Yes, one	Yes, two or more
127. got so far behind in a course that before I realized it, it was too late to catch up	( )	( )	( )
128. been in a course slanted too heavily toward persons going from here into a job in that field	( )	( )	( )
129. taken a course geared too much to students planning to go to a four-year college	( )	( )	( )
130 had a course I thought would be dull turn out to be interesting	( )	( )	( )
131. had a course I thought would be interesting turn out to be dull	( )	( )	( )

		Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
I need . . .						
132.	someplace on campus where I can study with other students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
133.	someplace on campus where I can study without being disturbed	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
134.	more information about what the job situation will be like when I leave here	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
135.	a child care center on or near the campus	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
136.	a locker on campus--something I don't have now	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
137.	help finding a temporary or part-time job	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

		Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
The college should . . .							
138.	make available a large group of good students that other students could go to individually when they need help with studies		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
139.	limit more library books to one-day circulation so they would be more available		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
140.	stock more copies of texts and other required books in the library for rental by the day or week		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
141.	cut down the time students spend filling out forms by computerizing the routine administrative work		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
142.	cut out unessential but compulsory student costs, such as those for student activities, intercollegiate athletics, the student newspaper, etc.		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
143.	put more of its employees on a part-time basis so students could be hired		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
144.	offer more courses and programs for people in the community who are not regular students		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
145.	have student records and transcripts show only a list of the courses the student has passed, without grades		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
The college should . . .						
146. record grades only in a student's major field, and just list the other courses a student has passed		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
147. offer more courses related to ethnic issues		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
148. provide more activities for special groups of students instead of general campus-wide activities		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
149. let students enroll in classes they feel they can handle, regardless of their test scores or previous grades		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
150. add several days at the beginning of the term to allow students more time to work out their programs		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
151. let as many students as want to take any class with any instructor even if some classes become huge		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
152. enforce campus regulations more firmly		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
153. let student groups organize and meet on campus without having to get permission from the administration		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
154. deny permission to speak on campus to nonstudents with extreme political or social views		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
155. let students drop a course at any time without being given a failing grade		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Not Applicable	Definitely Not	No	?	Yes	Definitely Yes
The college should . . .						
156. provide more opportunities to get together with other students on campus		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
157. drop the activities fee; I can take care of my own activities	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Appendix D-1

Corresponding Items

Trial Version	Final Version	Trial Version	Final Version	Trial Version	Final Version
1	21	45	32	88	
2		46	34	89	24
3	19	47	33	90	
4	4	48		91	
5	20	49	35	92	25
6	5	50	116	93	
7	130	51		94	55
9	47	52	117	95	27
10	7	53	36	96	
11		54	118	97	
12	48	55		99	
13	49	56	37	100	
14	50	58	93	101	
15		59	73	102	
16		60	99	103	
17	51	61		104	52
18	46	62		105	53
20	45	63		106	79
21		64	74	107	127
22	17	65	75	109	132
23	9	66	76	110	139
24	6, 10	67		111	140
25		69		112	
26	18	70	94	113	138
27	11	71	134	115	
29	58	72	68	116	
30	59	73	69	117	
31	60	74	77	118	
32	61	75	147	119	
33	62	76		120	
34		77		121	
35		79		122	122
36	63	80		124	96
37		81		125	
38		82	129	126	123
40		83		127	87
41		84		128	107
42	64	86	22	129	80
43		87		130	

Trial Version	Final Version	Trial Version	Final Version	Trial Version	Final Version
131	81	175	142	220	
132		177		221	
133	30	178		223	71
135	141	179	135	224	
136		180		225	
137		181		226	157
138	150	183			
139	151	184	38		
140	154	185			
141	152	186	39		
142	153	187			
143		188	29		
144		189			
145		190	56		
147		192	31		
148	88	193			
149	41, 102	194			
150		195			
151		197	110		
152		198	1		
153	57	199	111		
154	42	200	82		
155	43	201	83		
156		202			
158		203	103		
159		204	85		
160	44	205	2		
161	89	206			
162	115	207	106		
163	90	208			
164	23	209	112		
165	137	210	108		
166		211	109		
167	92	212			
169	84	213	3		
170		214	104		
171	91	216			
172	70	217	144		
173		218			
174		219	148		